

CHURCH REFORM

Dw.

The University of Chicago
Libraries



GIFT OF

Helen C. Gumsaulus



With the Compliments
of the Author

CHURCH REFORM.



CHURCH REFORM,

IN FOUR CHAPTERS:

- I.—The Christian Church.
- II.—Convocation.
- III.—Church Reform Necessary.
- IV.—A Plan of Church Reform Proposed.

With NOTES on the Administrations of the last
Three Bishops of St. David's—

[Bishops Connop Thirlwall, W. Basil Jones,
and John Owen.

BY THE

Rev. E. L. D. ^{aried -} GLANLEY, M.A.,

Rector of Ystradgynlais.

“Her foundations are upon the holy hills.”

“The gates of Hell shall not prevail against her.”

“The Lord loveth the gates of Sion more than all the dwellings
of Jacob.”

YSTALYFERA:

G. Davies, Printer and Stationer, Stamp Office.

BX 5165
D 25

WE DEDICATE THIS BOOK TO ALL TRUE
AND FAITHFUL MEMBERS OF THE ONE HOLY
CATHOLIC APOSTOLIC CHURCH THROUGHOUT THE
WORLD.

PREFACE.

In publishing these four chapters on Church Reform and Notes on two of the Bishops of St. David's, we have one object, and only one in view, namely, the good of Christ's Church.

We thoroughly and conscientiously believe that this great object cannot be obtained without an earnest, thorough, and somewhat drastic Church Reform.

There are many subjects pertaining to the Church which loudly call for reform, but we have treated upon only one subject, but this one is of great importance, as it comes in closer contact than all the others with the affairs of the present life, and therefore injures more immediately through its earthly corrupting influences the success of the Church.

THE AUTHOR.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

THERE are different opinions among Christian writers about the exact time when the Christian Church was established. It is generally acknowledged that she was established by our Lord Jesus Christ, but there are some who maintain that she was established by our Lord's blessed Apostles. We would prefer the belief that the Christian Church had her formal existence on the Cross when the blessed Saviour was sleeping the sleep of death upon the cursed tree, and when a soldier pierced His side and thrust his sword through His heart, when there came forth blood and water, emblems of the two sacraments of the Church. The first Adam was alone in the garden of paradise and could not find among the inferior creation a help-meet for him, but the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam and while asleep a woman was taken from his side and became his wife. Exactly in a similar manner God by his determinate counsel and fore-knowledge brought the second Adam into the world and led him on to the Cross and there while sleeping in the arms of death the Lord took from His blessed side His bride—the Church, which became His wife, and whom He loves with an everlasting love.

The Christian Church was therefore established by our Lord Jesus Christ. The Jewish Church was established by God the Father in the wilderness at the foot of Mount Sinai. The two Churches, the Jewish

and the Christian, are alike. The Jewish is the shadow, the Christian is the substance. The Jewish is the type, the Christian is the anti-type. The Jewish is the model, the Christian is the exact imitation. The Jewish circumcision is the Christian baptism. The Jewish sacrifices are the Christian sacraments. The Jewish annual feasts are the Christian annual festivals. The ministers of the Jewish Church and the tribe of Levi are the true representatives of the Christian hierarchy. The constitution, the government and the ordinances of the Church at Sinai are truly emblematic of the Church at Jerusalem.

We shall now proceed to show how similar, how identical, how truly representative, is the Jewish Church of the Christian Church in almost every particular:

I.—CIRCUMCISION AND BAPTISM. The ordinance of circumcision was given by God himself to Abraham. He was commanded to circumcise himself, his children and his male dependents, and by means of this ordinance they were made formally the children of God. The age of circumcision was eight days, but Abraham was circumcised when he was ninety and nine years. Ishmael his son was circumcised when he was thirteen years. His younger son Isaac was circumcised when eight days old. This was the right age of circumcision, and the only reason why Abraham and his son Ishmael were circumcised, the former at ninety and nine and the latter at thirteen, was that they happened to be of these ages when the ordinance of circumcision was given. The rite of circumcision made the children of Israel members of the Jewish Church. Before circumcision they were aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and were outside of the covenant God

made with Abraham that he would be their God, but after circumcision and by means of the ordinance of circumcision they were brought within the covenant and were made members of the Jewish Church, and were henceforth called the covenanted people of God. In the Christian Church and under the New Testament baptism does exactly the same thing that circumcision did under the Old Testament in the Jewish Church. Children born into the world are born in sin and in a state of alienation from God, but by the ordinance of baptism the children are transferred from the state of sin in which they were born into a state of grace; brings them within the covenant so that all baptized children and all baptized adults are members of the Church which Christ established on the earth, and as such they enjoy all the privileges of the people of God and His covenanted mercies. We are somewhat anxious to emphasize this fact that the Jewish Church is a type of the Christian Church, and that as circumcision made the children of Israel members of the Jewish Church so in like manner baptism makes the children members of the Christian Church, and can claim all the blessings of God by covenant. The Christian Church is not so uncharitable as to deny the blessings of salvation to unbaptized children, but from the necessity of the case she has no alternative but to leave them to the uncovenanted mercies of God. If any find a difficulty in the case of baptizing children and say that infants being in a state of unconsciousness are incapable of receiving any benefit or of appreciating any blessings conferred upon them by baptism, we have our answer ready at hand that children in the Jewish Church were circumcised when they were eight days old and therefore equally incapable of receiving any conscious blessing through circumcision. And we know without a shadow of doubt that God himself fixed the age of circumcision. However it is not

maintained that either Jewish children through circumcision or Christian children through baptism derive any conscious benefit from the administration of these ordinances, but we nevertheless strictly maintain that they do receive most valuable blessings, for a change of condition takes place and the children are removed by these rites from a state of sin into a state of salvation. This is done without any act of consciousness on the part of the children. When slavery was practised in the Southern States of America we sometimes heard of parents and children who were in slavery making their escape to a free State. The parents felt the benefit of freedom immediately, but their babes did not understand and were not conscious of any difference in their condition. In after years, when these babes grew up and were educated, they came to understand the difference between slavery and freedom, and they now saw clearly that the escape of their parents was the means of breaking their chains and conferring upon them also the glorious benefits of liberty. Though we have mentioned as the advantages to the children by circumcision and baptism as only a change of condition, we could proceed further and mention the possibility of other mysterious advantages. God by means of his divine ordinances might confer blessings upon children of tender years which may remain latent within them and which might develop into spiritual graces after reaching the age of reason and understanding. Our Lord Jesus Christ took little children into His arms and blessed them. Could we as christian believers deny that our Lord actually gave and that the children actually received some mysterious benefits which would be favourable to their spiritual growth in after life. If Christ thus blessed little children who must have been in a condition of unconsciousness, can we disbelieve with any show of consistency that God through the ordinances

of circumcision and baptism could confer similar blessings? Our Father in heaven is jealous of His own divine appointments, and could make them special means of blessings to His churches whether Jewish or Christian.

II.—THE PASCHAL LAMB. This Lamb was typical of the death of Christ upon the Cross. The eaten flesh and the sprinkled blood were a true representation of the blessed sacrament of the body and blood of our Saviour.

That night upon which the Israelites left their captivity in Egypt was a night ever to be remembered, for God had visited His people and brought them out of their cruel bondage into a state of happy freedom. Their enemies, the Egyptians, were confounded and punished for their wickedness. God on that memorable night brought all the Egyptians under condemnation through the death of the first-born in all their families throughout the land of Egypt. The Israelites were also sinners as well as the Egyptians and they deserved punishment also, like their enemies. God therefore brought the two nations, the Egyptians and the Israelites, under condemnation. However, in the case of the Israelites a substitute was appointed, and that substitute was to suffer the penalty of death instead of the first-born in the families of Israel. A lamb of a year old, and without blemish, was selected and put to death, its blood was received into a basin, and afterwards this blood was sprinkled on the lintel and the door-posts of all the houses in which resided the families of Israel. When the angel of punishment on that dreadful night passed through the land of Egypt he had special instructions not to touch any of the inhabitants dwelling in the houses sprinkled with blood. The sprinkled blood was a sign to the destroying angel, the angel of punishment, that all the families dwelling therein were not to be injured, were not to be touched, were perfectly

safe. The sprinkled blood did not only secure their safety, but the families themselves were actually feasting on the flesh of the lambs that were slain so that the sprinkled blood procured safety from the enemy and nourishment for their journey to their promised inheritance. The lambs of the Passover in Egypt were a type of the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world. Here was a spotless Lamb, without fault, without sin, and separate from sinners lifted up to the cursed cross, and there in the sight of the universe was put to death, His precious blood flowed from His pierced heart, which blood was a sign to angels and to devils not to touch anyone of the human family found sprinkled with the blood of Calvary. The sacrifice of the immaculate Lamb of God made atonement for the world, purchased liberty for the captives of sin, effected eternal reconciliation between heaven and earth. On the Cross of Calvary was exhibited the boundless love of our heavenly Father, His infinite pity for lost humanity, and the mighty exertion of His divine arm to bring back a lost race hastening to destruction unto a state of salvation. Who now shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth; who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea, rather, that is risen again, who is ever at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us. Who shall now or ever separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us. On Calvary the law had full satisfaction. On the Cross righteousness and peace kissed each other. On the tree of suffering the flesh and the blood were prepared for the cleansing, for the nourishment, and for the salvation of the mighty multitudes of the saved. The Holy Jesus commanded His priceless sacrifice to be com-

memorated by His Holy Church until His coming again. In this blessed sacrament of His body and blood, in this holy supper of faith and love, in these divine emblems of sadness and suffering, the whole body of true believers beautifully feel that they are delivered from captivity, that they are released from their cruel bondage, and are eternally set free from the consequences of transgression. The troops of the redeemed are being daily prepared for a glorious heaven and made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light.

III. — THE TABERNACLE, THE TEMPLE, AND THE SYNAGOGUES OF THE JEWS WERE TYPICAL OF THE CHRISTIAN CATHEDRALS, CHURCHES AND SANCTUARIES. When God established His Church in the wilderness at the foot of Mount Sinai men were divinely inspired to construct a Tabernacle, a special house for God to dwell amongst His people. This house consisted of, first, the most holy place where God himself dwelt, and whose presence was visible between the Cherubim on the Mercy Seat. The second portion of this Tabernacle was the holy place where the priests performed their sacred offices as the ministers of God. The third part of this house was that in which was erected the altar of burnt-offering, where the various sacrifices were offered daily, weekly, monthly, and annually. This Tabernacle consisted also of several courts, all of which were considered sacred, and no strangers were admitted except to the outer court which was called the court of the Gentiles. When reading the history of God's descent upon Mount Sinai, the building of the Tabernacle, and the appointment of ministers to serve therein, the first impression that is left on the mind is that the God of heaven is an infinitely Holy Being, and that no man dare approach His awful presence without careful circumspection, without

deep humiliation, and without becoming reverence. When Jehovah descended upon the Mount among lightnings and thunders and earthquakes the whole adjacent land and its surroundings were considered as hallowed ground. Neither man nor beast was to approach the mountain on pain of death. Moses, himself the leader of the people, was overcome with a terrible fear. When God spake the words of the law in the hearing of the people they were not able to stand in His presence on account of their terror, and they expressed a wish that Moses should speak to them and not God. The high priest was not allowed to enter into the Holy of Holies except once a year, and not then without a most strict preparation. The priests in the exercise of their sacred office were not permitted to go into the holy place without washing their bodies in water and perform their services barefooted. All kinds of Jewish worship were performed with the deepest humiliation, with the meekest submission, and with the profoundest reverence. In this respect the holy places and the holy persons under the Old Testament represent the holy places and the holy persons under the New. Our cathedrals, our churches, and our sanctuaries have a tripartite division as in the Temple and Synagogues of the Jews. The first division in a church is that place where stands the holy table upon which are placed the sacred elements which commemorate the death of our Saviour Jesus Christ and is generally railed in and always considered the most sacred part of a cathedral or church. The second part of a church is the chancel where the leaders of the musical portions of the services are placed, and in sacredness is considered the second place in importance. The third part of a church is the nave where the whole body of the worshippers are congregated, and in point of sacredness takes the third place. The whole church and every part

of it is holy. It is the Church of the living God, where He has bound Himself to meet and bless His people. "Where two or three are gathered together in my name there am I in the midst of them." It stands true to reason that the worshipper who appears in the church must have in his heart a consciousness of the presence of God in His house. Without this consciousness no man can render unto his Maker a humble and true and laudable service. When this consciousness is really and truly felt in the heart of the believer there must of necessity be a humility, a reverence, a devotion that thoroughly becomes sinful men. When professors of religion go up to the house of the Lord in this state of penitence there cannot be any carelessness, any irreverence, any worldly objects occupying their thoughts, but only a sense of the nearness of the spiritual world. There is not a more beautiful sight on this earth than to see a congregation of christian people assembled together in a Christian Church, all in the spirit of true adoration, all waiting for the blessing, all tasting and enjoying a heavenly feast, all feeling that sweet communion that a true christian frequently feels between his soul and God. The Almighty Father will cause His graces to descend upon the heads of such a congregation in showers of blessing, and they will go home revived, encouraged, strengthened, resolved to persevere more than ever to proceed on their journey until they reach that blessed land where they will enjoy the presence of God for ever more. God's presence was with His people under the Old Testament in the Tabernacle, in the Temple, and in the Synagogues. God's presence in like manner is with His people under the New Testament in the Cathedrals, in the Churches, and in the Sanctuaries.

IV.—THE TRIBE OF LEVI UNDER THE OLD TESTAMENT WAS TYPICAL OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY

UNDER THE NEW TESTAMENT. When God established the Jewish Church at the foot of Mount Sinai the Israelites remained there for nearly a year, and during their stay there the Ten Commandments were given to Moses written by the finger of God on two tables of stone. The Tabernacle and all its belongings was completed; the next thing in order was to appoint ministers to duly perform the divine services. One of the twelve tribes was chosen to be the inheritance of the Lord. The whole tribe was considered more holy than the other tribes, but out of this tribe were ordained different degrees of ministers. Aaron, the brother of Moses, was selected to be the High Priest—the chief minister of religion; next to him were the second order, called the Priests, and were chosen from the family of Aaron. There was a third order of ministers who were called Levites. These three degrees of ministers who had each of them their own proper work to perform in the Tabernacle, and constituted the Jewish hierarchy. These were the immediate servants of God and were specially consecrated to perform the services in the Tabernacle, and afterwards in the Temple. We may remark here that the appointment of these ministers was not an act of Moses but of the Almighty God himself, and were directly typical of the ministers of the Christian Church. When the Lord Jesus Christ came into the world and when He commenced His public ministry among men, He established the Christian Church in strict imitation of the Church established by His Father under the Old Testament among the Jews. Christ emphatically declared that He did not come to break the law but to fulfil it—"Think not that I am come to destroy the law," He says, "or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." The Lord

Jesus commenced His public ministry; He appointed twelve disciples to be with Him to help Him in His great work. Afterwards He appointed seventy others also, and sent them to every village and city which He intended visiting. In this way Christ appointed three degrees of ministers, to be of the same number as they were in the Jewish Church. The Lord Jesus Himself took the place of the Jewish high priest; the twelve disciples took the place of the priests; and the seventy other disciples took the place of the Levites. The Lord Jesus appointed twelve to be of the same number as the twelve tribes and He appointed seventy to be of the same number as the seventy judges whom Moses appointed to help him to rule Israel in the wilderness, and to be of the same number as the Jewish Sanhedrim in aftertimes. When the Lord Jesus completed His work on earth He returned to His Father and when He had returned He left the chief office of the Church empty, but before His ascension He gave commandment to His twelve disciples, "Go ye into the world, and preach the gospel to every creature," thus appointing them as chief officers of His Church. The seventy disciples would naturally succeed to the second order. After a short time, as stated in the Acts of the Apostles in the sixth chapter, the third order was appointed. Seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom were set by the Church before the apostles, whom they ordained by prayer and the imposition of hands. There were always three degrees of ministers in the Jewish Church. There were always three degrees of ministers in the Christian Church from the time of Christ himself and through the intervening centuries to the present day, and doubtless will continue as long as the Church will continue militant.

V.—THE ANOINTING OIL FOR THE CONSECRATION OF THE JEWISH MINISTERS IS TYPICAL OF CHRISTIAN

ORDINATION. The anointing oil by which the priests and Levites were ordained to their several offices was prepared from sweet aromatic and precious spices by Moses by the special instruction of God. It had remarkable preserving qualities, and after using it to ordain the first ministers of the Jewish Church was laid aside and kept for future ordinations. This anointing oil was emblematic of the Holy Spirit, by whose outpouring the ministers of the Christian Church are believed to be anointed. The Lord Jesus, the great head of the Church, was Himself anointed on different occasions, especially at His incarnation and baptism to the three offices of prophet, priest and king. We have no special account of the ordination of the twelve apostles and the seventy disciples, but probably the selection of these apostles and disciples and their call to be fishers of men, and the constant presence of their Master with them, constituted to all intents and purposes an ordination. Though it is not specially recorded in the Gospels, yet we may thoroughly believe that the Lord Jesus earnestly prayed for the first preachers of His Gospel, and we read in the New Testament that He breathed upon them and said. Receive ye the Holy Ghost. "Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them." In the appointment of deacons, the third order of the Christian ministry, we have an account of a formal ordination. The apostles ask the members of the Church to choose from among themselves goodly men whom they, the apostles, should appoint to perform the office of the third order in the Church. The members of the Church selected seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom they set before the apostles, and when the apostles prayed they laid their hands upon them and thus ordained them to be deacons in the Church. Their work was to distribute charity, to preach the Gospel, and to baptize and to give help to the other

superior ministers of the Church. Under the Old Testament the anointing oil was poured upon the head, the seat of the understanding. Under the New Testament we find everywhere in the holy writings that the influences of the Holy Spirit were conveyed to its recipients by the laying on of the hands of the apostles and afterwards by the bishops and priests when laying their hands upon the heads of the candidates for ordination. The high and important office of a minister of the Gospel is infinitely too important and too sacred for any man to undertake it except he be first chosen and set apart and regularly ordained by proper authority. No one taketh this honour unto himself except he that is chosen as was Aaron.

VI.—THE HOLY GARMENTS OF THE JEWISH PRIESTHOOD WERE TYPICAL OF THE OFFICIAL GARMENTS OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY. A full account is given in the book of Exodus of the garments made for Aaron and his sons. The Levites also wore linen garments when they took part in the services of the Tabernacle and Temple. We find that God himself gives His reason why He commanded particular vestments to be worn by His ministers when discharging their holy duties. Their garments we are told were made for glory and for beauty. It is granted that there is no particular account in the New Testament about vestments and the wearing of vestments by the ministers of the Christian Church. There would be no necessity for a second command about vestments to be given in the New Testament since God the Father had given most minute instructions about vestments in the Old Testament. All official practices were to be carried on in the Christian Church in imitation of what God the Father had appointed in the Jewish Church. There are many ordinances and practices left in obscurity without any further commands given respecting them, and are left to the discretion of church authorities

who are expected to follow Old Testament examples. There is no command anywhere in the New Testament for women to partake of the holy sacrament, but it is not to be concluded from this omission that women should refrain from participating in the commemorative sacrament of the death of the Saviour. When the Christian Church was first established she had more of a missionary character than otherwise at the beginning of her great work. Afterwards, when churches were built and clergymen appointed and services composed and regulated, we have no hesitation in stating that the clergy performed the services and preached the Gospel clad in official garments.. Even in the first and second centuries we have an account of places where the vestments of the clergy were kept. It would appear with exceedingly bad taste, and would naturally be considered a great presumption which would reflect upon the majesty of God, for a man to stand forth to preach the Gospel of Christ clothed in his own common and usual dress. It would appear as if he came to speak in his own name and not in the name of the Lord Jesus. We therefore reasonably conclude that in the Christian Church from the beginning, throughout the centuries until now, and will continue to the last day, that as in the Jewish Church there were official vestments worn by the high priests, priests and Levites of that Church by the direct command of God, so also after the example of that Church official vestments, from the commencement of the Christian Church, were used by its ministers when performing services and preaching the Gospel of the kingdom in the name of the Lord.

VII.—THE JEWISH ANNUAL FEASTS UNDER THE OLD TESTAMENT WERE TYPICAL OF THE CHRISTIAN ANNUAL FESTIVALS UNDER THE NEW TESTAMENT. God directed Moses to keep the chief events in the history of the Jews in remembrance throughout their generations.

However, knowing the natural carelessness and thoughtlessness and forgetfulness of man, God commanded Moses to institute feasts which were kept annually in order to retain in memory the great events that took place in their history. Five of these annual feasts were instituted by Moses. These feasts were strictly commemorative. Without these feasts probably the chief dealings of God with His people would have been forgotten. The first feast was that of the Passover, which commemorated that wonderful night when all the first-born in the land of Egypt were slain. The destroying angel was commanded to go forth to destroy every first-born in the families of the Egyptians, but to pass by the houses of the children of Israel whose doorposts and lintels were sprinkled with the blood of the sacrificed lambs. The name of this feast was derived from the action of the destroying angel passing by the houses that were sprinkled with blood and did no injury to anyone dwelling therein. On that ever memorable night a nation of slaves were made a nation of freemen and immediately commenced their journey to the land of their inheritance.

The second annual feast was called the feast of Pentecost, which means fifty because it was kept fifty days after the Passover, and commemorated another most remarkable incident in the history of the children of Israel, namely, the descent of God on Mount Sinai where He gave His law to the people. The Israelites had now inherited their freedom, their enemies, the Egyptians, were drowned in the Red Sea, and it was now time they should be constituted a nation. They remained at the foot of Mount Sinai for nearly a year and here the Tabernacle was erected, the laws—moral, civil, and ceremonial were promulgated, and a national constitution given. This sojourn of the Israelites at Mount Sinai was a time of such importance to the nation that they were ever to

remember it. This feast of Pentecost was instituted to commemorate it throughout all generations.

The third annual feast was called the feast of Trumpets, because trumpets were blown throughout the whole land, which called the attention of the people to one great and important consideration that this day was the commencement of a new year. Time runs on silently and almost imperceptibly without a stop and without a break. By the contrivance of man as well as by natural laws time is divided into seconds, minutes, hours, days, weeks, months, and years. Our years make a complete revolution of the earth round the sun, and the commencement of a new year is a most proper time for men to think most seriously of the flight and rapidity of their journey through life. At the beginning of a year men ought to ask themselves some very serious questions such as these: Here am I at the beginning of another year, why am I allowed to see it when many of my fellow creatures have been called to another world. I have seen the commencement of it, shall I see the end of it, or will my life be terminated in this like many others? God in His mercy instructed Moses to institute a feast to commemorate the quickness and rapidity of time, and it should be a period of solemn reflection for all.

The fourth feast was that of the great day of Atonement. In many respects this day was considered by the Jews as the most important day of the year. It was the day upon which the high priest entered the Holy of Holies. It was on this day that one goat was sacrificed for Israel, and another goat was led into the wilderness with the sins of the whole nation reckoned upon its head. The people of Israel on the morning of this day were in great sorrow for their sins and for fear that some untoward event might occur to prevent the goat to take

away their sins. The result of this would be that the sins of the nation for a whole year would be retained and might bring upon them grievous punishment. The day that commenced in penitence and lamentation generally ended in happiness, gladness, and joy at the fact that their sins for another year were safely removed and they a free people rejoicing in the mercies of their God.

The fifth and last feast instituted by Moses was the feast of Tabernacles. This feast was specially a feast of commemoration, like the Passover and Pentecost. It was established for the purpose of bringing back and living over again the journeying of their forefathers for forty years in the wilderness. The children of Abraham were to come from the east and from the west, and the north and the south, and to assemble in the holy city, Jerusalem, and were to live in tents for seven days that they may exactly imitate their fathers of olden times who lived in tents on their march from Egypt, the land of their captivity, to Canaan, the land of promise.

These five annual feasts, kept at different periods of the year by the Israelites throughout their generations, not only were commemorating the chief events and the dealings of God with them in the wilderness, but they actually lived these times over again so that they might be indelibly imprinted on their memories for ever. These were times looked forward to by the whole nation, and as they travelled together in families and in companies from year to year they formed new friendships and revived old friendships, and the whole people in this way became acquainted with each other. These times were times of great rejoicing, and the whole land of Palestine was a sea of song. At certain halting places, when the troops met each other, great was their joy when the pilgrim bands drew near to the holy city, Jerusalem, and beheld

the Temple on Mount Moriah their songs of praise were at their utmost height. Their voices could be distinctly heard reverberating among the hills of Moab on the east, and the valley of the Jordan, and also on the west far down towards the shores of the Mediterranean sea. The Jewish nation were the happiest people on the face of the earth when they remained faithful and walked in the commandments of the Lord. Their joy seemed unbounded when commemorating in these their annual meetings at Jerusalem the wonderful works of God amongst them.

These five annual feasts of the Jewish Church are typical of the five great annual festivals of the Christian Church. Christians should rejoice infinitely more than the Jews when commemorating the far greater events in their annual festivals of which the first is the Christmas Day festival. Christmas is a day of great rejoicing, for the Christian Church on this wonderful day commemorate the miraculous birth of the Saviour of the world. At each anniversary of the incarnation the Church partakes of the wonder of the shepherds on the fields of Bethlehem when the heavenly light shined around them. She hears the voice of the angel saying, "Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord." She listens to the song of the multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying, "Glory be to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men." After the departure of the angelic host she goes with the four shepherds, Misael, Acheel, Cyriacus and Stephanos, towards Bethlehem in search of the young child, according to the words of the angel. She, with the shepherds, finds Joseph and Mary, and the babe lying in a manger. After finding them she again returns with the shepherds and as it is her great mission she makes known abroad and through-

out the world the saying which was told her concerning this Child. With the shepherds also she is glorifying and praising God for all she had heard and seen. The Church at Christmas-tide recalls to memory the coming of the wise men from the east guided by a star to visit the King of the Jews, whose names were Melchior, Caspar, and Balthazzar, and they offered him their gifts of gold, frankincense, and myrrh.

The second great event commemorated by the Christian Church is that of Good Friday. Upon this ever memorable day she looks with weeping eyes at the sad incidents that took place. She sees her dear Saviour in the garden of Gethsemane on His knees praying with great drops of blood from His blessed face falling to the ground. She follows Him to Jerusalem and sees Him tried before the two high priest Annas and Caiaphas. She goes with him when he is taken before Pontius Pilate, by whom He is delivered to be crucified. She again accompanies Him to the Mount of Calvary and sees the preparation made for His crucifixion. She sees Him lifted up on the cursed cross and hears the seven sayings He uttered when hanging there. She is a witness of the scorn of His enemies, the conversion of the penitent thief, the piercing of His side by a soldier, the testimony of the centurion, "This was a righteous man," of the darkness that took place, and of the great earthquake. Yes, the Christian Church on every Good Friday re-visits the scene of the crucifixion and the death of her beloved bridegroom.

The third great festival of the Christian Church is the Resurrection of her Lord, and with great joy and thanksgiving she commemorates the coming forth of Him from the tomb to life, for evermore having conquered death and bringing life and blessed immortality to His people. Two honourable men, Joseph of Arimathea and

Nicodemus, took down the body of Jesus and buried it in a tomb hewn in the rock in the immediate neighbourhood of Calvary, and a large stone was put over the mouth of the cave and this stone was sealed by the command of Pilate, a guard of soldiers also were placed by the tomb to watch it. However, in the face of all precautions, on the morning of the third day the blessed Saviour came forth alive and made the public declaration, "I am He that was dead, and behold I am alive; and will live for evermore, and I have the keys of hell and of death." The Christian Church will ever remember and will ever sing her loudest hosannahs to the victor of death and the grave.

The fourth great festival of the Christian Church is that of the Ascension—the returning of the Saviour to heaven. The great object He had in view when He came down to visit this part of His eternal dominions was not to enjoy Himself but He came here to work and for that purpose He took to Himself human nature—flesh of man's flesh—the working clothes of humanity, and in this human nature he went down into the mighty depths, into the place where the world had fallen, and with eternal power He brought it up from the great abyss of sin and degradation and placed it once more in a condition in which the great governor of the universe could honourably pardon its sin and forgive its transgression. The Lord Jesus took with Him His disciples and friends to the Mount of Olives, and there while in the act of blessing them He ascended in a cloud to heaven and now sitteth on the right hand of God, and there He will remain until all His enemies are made His footstool. Ascension Thursday is a day to be ever remembered by the Christian Church as one of her annual festivals until her Lord returns the second time to judge the world in righteousness.

The fifth annual festival to be remembered is the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the assembled disciples, and upon the members of the infant Church in Jerusalem. When the blessed Saviour reached the right hand of His Father He sent, according to His promise, on the tenth day after His ascension, being the day of Pentecost, the Holy Spirit upon the apostles and disciples who were waiting at Jerusalem, "And were all with one accord in one place when suddenly there came a sound from heaven like a rushing mighty wind, and there appeared unto them cloven tongues as of fire and they were filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." When these mighty effects were seen and known amongst the people of Jerusalem the multitude came together and were confounded. The inhabitants of Jerusalem were filled with utter astonishment and were beyond measure amazed at the strange manifestations and the wonderful works of God. This glorious event—the wonderful descent of the Holy Spirit will be commemorated by the Christian Church on her Whit Sundays throughout all coming generations.

From what we have already recorded we observe that there were five most wonderful events, five most extraordinary occurrences, five most marvellous incidencies, which took place among the Jewish people under the Old Testament, and worthy of everlasting remembrance. Most of them were miraculous performances wrought by the mighty arm of the God of Israel. The great deliverance from the Egyptian captivity, the giving of the Law, and the establishment of the Jewish Church, the blowing of trumpets throughout the land at the beginning of a new year when the people were specially called to consider the swiftness of time, the great day of atonement when Israel's sins for a whole year were forgiven; the feast of Tabernacles, when the people were commanded to live in tents for

seven days to commemorate the forty years' journey through the wilderness. These five feasts of the Jewish nation were considered so transcendently important that they were to be commemorated annually by the direct command of Jehovah. By means of these five feasts God was kept among His chosen people. These five feasts were directly connected with the Jewish Church and Jewish worship. When God dwelt with His people His divine blessings descended abundantly upon them, and His promise was fulfilled to them as the prophet saith, "I will be as the dew unto Israel." At the times of these five feasts the children of Israel were to go to Jerusalem to sacrifice and to worship and to rejoice in the Lord. By their annual journeys to and from Jerusalem five times a year the unity of the nation was preserved. Their goings and comings so frequently to the city of David and home brought them so much in contact with each other that all the people were acquaintances and friends with each other. The five annual feasts were centres of attraction to the whole nation. The people were never happier than when they attended the feasts at Jerusalem. These times were times of purest joy to the whole nation. These annual feasts uplifted the people of Israel above all the surrounding nations. If these five annual institutions had no existence, then the Jews would have been as miserable as any other people in the world. The feasts kept the remembrance of God among them, and for this reason they were the excellent of the earth. Without God and His worship and His Temples and His ordinances the world would have dwelt in darkness, without knowledge and without religion. In the same way that the Jewish Church have her five feasts, which commemorate the greatest events that took place under the Old Testament dispensation, so the Christian Church has also her five annual festivals which commemorate occurrences in

the history of the blessed Saviour, and which are destined to continue until His second coming on the clouds of heaven. These are His incarnation in Bethlehem Judea, His death by crucifixion on Calvary, His victorious resurrection from the dead from the tomb of Joseph on the third day, His glorious ascension from the Mount of Olives to sit on the right hand of His Father, and the descent of the Holy Ghost. As far as we know creation these five incidences in connection with the Christian Church are the most important and the most wonderful that have ever taken place in the universe of God. It is through the Christian Church that the manifold works of God in creation and redemption are made known. The present Christian Church of England, and the churches in connection with her, is the very identical Church that was established by the Lord Jesus Christ and His apostles. The Church established in the United Kingdom is at present the purest branch of the Church Apostolic. It is the Church whose doctrines was preached by St. Paul, the great Apostle of the Gentiles. It is the Church whose ministers are in a direct apostolic succession. It is the Church which has been faithful to her great mission of evangelizing the nations. It is the Church that has carried the glad tidings of great joy to a perishing world. It is the Church which stands pre-eminently to-day after manfully fighting for two thousand years against the world, the flesh, and the devil, as the great defender of the faith which was once given to the saints. It is the Church which has taught her children to renounce the devil and all his works, the pomps and vanities of this wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh. It is the Church which has taught the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures in their absolute purity, and has diligently encouraged its members to keep God's holy will and commandments, and to ever walk in the same. It is the

Church which has uplifted humanity from its deep degradation and has shown the world the way of life. It is the Church which has successfully battled for twenty centuries with empires, kingdoms, principalities, and powers who have done their best to compass her destruction and annihilation. It is the Church beyond any other which can claim the blessed promise of her Lord that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her. What can we say more of this glorious Church which looketh forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners! Proceed thou daughter of Sion with all the blessings of heaven upon thy head to conquer the world, to present thyself a glorious Church to thy beloved Lord and Master, who presently will come to fetch His beautiful bride home to His eternal mansions in the skies.



CHAPTER II.

CONVOCATION.

Convocation is the chief ecclesiastical institution of the Christian Church and its power to rule in Church affairs ought to be supreme. Under the Old Testament dispensation, Moses, the leader of the children of Israel, at the advice and instigation of Hobab, his father-in-law, appointed seventy elders to assist him in judging the people. The chief council of the Jews, in aftertimes called the Sanhedrim, consisted of seventy members—undoubtedly following the example of the seventy elders appointed by Moses. The connection between the civil government and the ecclesiastical government under the Old Testament was a most friendly one. Under a theocratic government it could not less than be so. When the nation desired a king to rule over them, like the surrounding pagan nations, God instructed Samuel to “hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee, for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them.” The desire of the nation for a king like the other nations was really a rejection of the Lord. However, God allowed the people to have a king, but there was one great condition to be observed on the part of the Israelites. They were not under a king to be independent of the Lord. The king and themselves were still to walk in the commandments of the Lord, and Samuel was to continue to pray for them, and advised them in the following words: “Only fear the Lord and serve Him in truth with all your heart, for consider how great things He hath done for you. But if ye shall still do wickedly, ye shall be

consumed, both ye and your king." It is perfectly evident that in all earthly governments of whatever kind, whether republics, kingdoms or empires they are to exercise their powers under God, and by His help, and that nation that will reject the Lord that nation and its ruler will be consumed. In all connections between civil governments and the Christian Church rulers would act wisely by looking backwards to Old Testament times and take the Jewish civil government as a pattern of their own. The relationship between the Jewish civil government and the Jewish Church was a most friendly one. The Jewish civil government naturally existed before the establishment of a national Church. Wherever men exist in communities there must be at once certain rules agreed upon which regulate their lives and duties towards each other. It cannot be imagined that a community of people could live together without some form of government however rudimentary that government might be. A nation of savages has rules and laws and a form of government. We must, therefore, come to the conclusion that some form of civil government must exist before the establishment of any form of religion. An ecclesiastical government cannot possibly be called to existence before the pre-existence of a civil government. God appeared to Moses in the wilderness of Paran and commanded him to return to Egypt and appear before Pharaoh, the king, to demand the release of the children of Israel from captivity. The king of Egypt was most reluctant to allow the people to go, but after punishing him with ten plagues the king became agreeable to do so. After receiving permission to go the captive Israelites at once commenced their journey back to Canaan. In three months after their departure from Egypt the children of Israel arrived at the foot of Mount Sinai. God met His people there. He came down to them amidst thunders and lightnings and an earth-

quake to give them His laws. The children of Israel remained at Sinai for nearly a whole year. It was at Sinai that they were constituted a nation. They were not a nation in Egypt but captives. They were not a nation when travelling from Egypt through the wilderness of Shur, but fugitives. Now, however, when they had come as far as Sinai, and were free from danger on the part of their enemies, there was at present leisure to think and time enough for God to establish order among them. Moses had led them out of Egypt and through the wilderness until they came to Sinai, a place of safety. God had appeared to Moses before, but now He appears to the whole congregation and proclaims Himself to be their God, as He was the God of their fathers. God now formally constitutes them as a nation, and establishes both a civil government and an ecclesiastical government among them. He gives them His laws, moral, civil, and ceremonial. He also gives them rules, statutes, and judgments by which they were henceforth to live as a nation of free people. Here, in fact, at Sinai, we see a divine plan of a civil and an ecclesiastical government and a divine example for all governments that would exist in all future times. God, at Sinai, did not only establish civil and ecclesiastical institutions but also gave a model for all future governments as long as the world endures. God, at Sinai, in a very special manner submitted to His servant Moses a plan and specification for building the Tabernacle, a church in which He Himself was going to dwell among His people, and inspires two men of Israel with the spirit of wisdom, and of understanding, and of knowledge, to enable them to build a house for the God of Israel. God had appointed Moses before to be a ruler over His people. He now appoints ministers, who should perform the sacred duties of religion. God appointed Aaron, the brother of Moses, to be high priest. He

appointed the sons of Aaron to be priests and the Levites were appointed to conduct the musical services of the Tabernacle. The tribe of Levi was chosen out of the twelve tribes to be the Lord's portion. This tribe had no inheritance in land, but the other tribes were to pay tithes, and certain cities were given them for their subsistence, but no land like the others, because the Lord was to be their inheritance.

From the remarks made previously we find that it was God Himself who established both forms of government among the Israelites, the civil and the ecclesiastical, and that He gave to both their rulers and laws appropriate to each. Now, since God had made all the appointments according to His own will in both institutions we can therefore at present judge exactly and decide without any doubt the nature of the relationship which was to exist between the State and the Church. We observe that He appointed Moses ruler, and Aaron high priest. These two were brothers, and it is considered that brotherhood is the closest natural lateral relationship that can exist among men. What does this fact prove? Does it not prove, and that beyond any question, that the relationship between the State and the Church should be one of the most intimate and friendly character? They are to be like Moses and Aaron, loving brothers. The nature of the duties each institution has to perform proves the same truth. Civil and ecclesiastical governments are established upon the same principles and are founded upon the same moral law that was given on Sinai. The great object for which civil powers are established is for making, teaching, and administering the laws of the kingdoms that do exist, but these laws among civilised nations are always founded on morality, consequently their administration are moral, just, and righteous. The duties of civil governments are to protect the persons and

possessions of their subjects. It is evident they cannot do this without providing for the same. They are to be careful that no foreign foe should invade them and disturb their peace. They must also provide fit men to distribute justice between the subjects, and that kindness and honesty and truth should prevail among all men. The object for which an ecclesiastical power is established is very similar to the civil. It is the Church's duty to enlighten, to persuade, to teach, to encourage all men of all earthly governments to live honestly, soberly, righteously, and to observe the laws of Christ's kingdom generally. The civil and ecclesiastical powers perform duties which are almost identical, only that the civil administration of its laws are confined to the welfare of its subjects in this life principally, whereas the administration of the ecclesiastical laws take cognisance of the happiness and benefit of men not in this world only, but principally their welfare, their happiness and their salvation in the life eternal. There ought not to be any opposition, any contrariety, any enmity between these powers, and therefore there is no reason whatever why their relationship between each other should not be of the most loving and friendly nature. In the times of the judges and of the kings of Judah and Israel, as well as the times between the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity and the coming of the Messiah, there existed a brotherly feeling between the Jewish State and the Jewish Church. Some of the kings of Israel and Judah lived most wicked and profligate lives, and dared to introduce into their kingdom the false gods of the surrounding nations, and gave every encouragement to idolatry and the worship of idols, but these ungodly kings, through their disobedience to the God of Israel, brought upon themselves personally the vengeance of God upon their heads, as well as all manner of pains and penalties upon their people. Though the kings of Israe

and Judah lived under a theocracy, their kings exercised as autocratic a power over their subjects as many emperors do in the present day. David the king instituted a reform among the priests that he divided them into twenty-four courses, and ordered each course to perform their sacred offices for one week in their turn in the holy place of the Tabernacle. David and other good kings introduced reforms on many occasions in Church and State, and were the means thereby of exalting their kingdoms to great honour and happiness. Another king of Judah, Jehoshaphat, sent teachers throughout his kingdom to teach the people the laws that God gave to Moses in the wilderness, and he, in this manner, did great good to the people of Judah. On the other hand, the ungodly and wicked kings of Israel and Judah were the means, through their disobedience to God, of bringing great calamities upon the children of Israel. Jeremiah the prophet spoke words from the mouth of the Lord, and he instructed Baruch, the scribe, to write them in a roll of a book. Baruch afterwards was commanded by the prophet to take the book and read what was written therein in the court of the Temple in the hearing of the people. In a short time it was known throughout Jerusalem and to King Jehoiacim, the very remarkable words that the prophet Jeremiah had commanded Baruch to read in the hearing of the people in the Temple. At a short notice Baruch was summoned to the royal presence and asked to read the words to the king. The words in the roll were written in different portions, and when one portion was read it was handed over to the king and he cut the leaves with a penknife and threw them into the fire until the whole book was burnt and destroyed. The words of the Almighty, spoken to the prophet Jeremiah, and written by Baruch, the scribe, were thus completely consumed. This dreadful responsibility rests upon this wicked King

Jehoiacim of destroying the words of the Lord. In limited monarchies in our day kings have not the same power as had the kings of the east in the Old Testament times. The chief power has now developed upon the representatives of the people, upon Prime Ministers, Cabinets and Parliaments. The chief responsibility rests at present upon Cabinets and the chairmen of these Cabinets, men who are called in England Prime Ministers. It is possible for these men to introduce measures into Parliament, and persuade men who have not an atom of respect for religion, and by large majorities they may make laws which are most detrimental to Christ's gospel, to religion, and to the kingdom. The Government of England has been guilty by recent legislation of banishing the Bible from the schools of the kingdom that it might not be taught to the rising generation. This dreadful act of our legislators comes practically to the same thing as the act of Jehoiacim, king of Judah, when he cut with his penknife the leaves of the Book in which the words of God were written and threw them to the fire. Each member of Parliament who was guilty of casting his vote in favour of excluding the Holy Scriptures from the schools, is individually as responsible as the king of Judah, and every one of these men is to all intention a Jehoiacim.

When our Lord Jesus Christ commenced His public ministry in the land of Palestine He did not consult the civil power, or ask permission of king or Sanhedrim, or sought a license from state or ruler to allow Him to preach His gospel, or permission to establish His Church. These facts prove most conclusively that the Christian Church has a right, yes, a divine right to exist among the kingdoms of the earth. The Lord Jesus Himself, His blessed apostles, and the first ministers of His Church, were persecuted to the death because they persisted to preach the gospel of the kingdom against the wishes and

commands of earthly rulers. Our blessed Lord was Himself put to a most ignominious death, having been betrayed by Judas Iscariot to the hands of His enemies. In the history of the world we have an account of exceedingly great sinners, but it is generally conceded that the greatest, the highest, the most hellish sin ever committed on this earth was that sin of Judas Iscariot when he betrayed his Master unto the rulers of the Jews. The fact that he did so under the garb of friendship enhanced the enormity of his sin a thousand times over. He betrayed the Son of Man with a kiss. A kiss is the emblem of friendship, of kindness, and of love, but the kiss of Judas was a malicious, a devilish, a hypocritical kiss. The sin of Judas is a sin of the first magnitude. The sin of Judas reached the utmost bounds of atrocity. The cleverest, the blackest, the foulest archangel in the depths of hell could not conceive nor accomplish a greater. It is easily the biggest monstrosity of the world. This sin of the Iscariot has been elevated, like the serpent of brass by Moses in the wilderness, and set as it were upon a pole for all the future ages of the world to look at—lifted up for general exhibition. It is supposed that Judas, before he could have committed the greatest possible sin, must have been possessed by legions of evil spirits. We read in one of the gospels of a man in Gadara who had a legion of devils in him. It is probably possible that legions without number had entered the heart of Judas Iscariot to enable him and assist him to commit such a devilish sin—a sin of the first magnitude. Some men are of opinion that these legions of wicked spirits who took possession of Judas and who tempted him to sell his blessed Master to His enemies were afterwards condemned to suffer condign punishment for taking part in this most awful of crimes, and were kept in closer confinement in the prison-house of the bottomless pit, and were not allowed the same

liberty as before for the space of about two thousand years. Some of the less guilty of these demons have been released already, and instead of repenting of their great wickedness (we suppose that there is no repentance in hell) they have taken part in the same work as before. They took a prominent part in the death of the great Founder of the Church, now again they are attempting to compass the destruction of the Church herself. Immediately after these foul spirits were allowed to leave their prison they came down with full speed to this earth to influence the politicians of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and do their level best to turn its voters to become radicals and atheistical socialists.

We have not a word to say against reforming Christian Socialists, for our Lord Himself was the greatest social reformer that ever appeared in our world. He declared with pride that He came to preach His gospel to the poor; He came to elevate to higher positions the lower classes of Palestine—the publicans and sinners, who heard him gladly. But the atheists, the infidels, the non-believing socialists, and the dishonest radicals are the pests of society, are the disturbers of the peace of the world, are under the full influence of wicked spirits, like Judas, who betrayed his Master with a kiss. The political radicals of our country are imitating the hypocrisy of the fallen apostle to perfection. It is more than probable that Judas when betraying Jesus thought he was doing good, and that his betrayal of Him would only give Him an opportunity to show His divine power, and to prove His divinity and His mission as the Saviour. The traitor was evidently trying to give to himself some excuses for his sin, and to deceive himself in this way, whereas he was only really gratifying his ruling passion, and wanted at any cost to make more money. These enemies of the Church are thoroughly and completely

imitating and following the example of the Iscariot. The radicals and non-christian socialists are loud in their protestations that they do not want to injure the Church, but to assist her to do more good in the world ; whereas their only wish is to gratify their passions of hatred and jealousy and animosity against her. These wicked men give to the Church (and pretending friendship) the same hypocritical kiss that Judas gave to her Founder. The Holy Jesus, when he was lifted up to the Cross and suffering the greatest agonies of his crucifixion, prayed for his enemies, "Father, forgive them ; for they know not what they do." We are of the undoubted opinion that the forgiving Saviour would sooner pardon the men who injured Himself personally than these who touch and rob and act cruelly towards His Church—his bride. It is believed that the traitor, who is now gone to his own place, is spending his time in running about like an insane spirit through the gloomy regions of the lost, and crying out in the bitterness of his soul through the different chambers of his prison house, and without rest day or night, saying, "I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood." His guilty lamentations send a thrill of horror through the whole of hell, and his dismal howlings cast a deeper gloom over the miserable inhabitants of the land of perdition. What think ye will be the punishment of these hypocritical enemies of the Church, who with all their might desire to put violent hands upon her sacred property and rob her of her honest means whereby she is enabled to preach the gospel of salvation to a lost world ? We verily believe that these men, perhaps in the company of the spirit of Judas, will be the most miserable souls in in all eternity.

It appears from the pages of inspiration, from the New Testament writers, and from christian history generally, that persecutors, plunderers, and robbers of holy

things, especially of the Christian Church, when they come to their right mind and their feelings, have undergone a radical change and are truly converted from their former wickednesses, are for a while the most miserable of men. God may have forgiven them their former sins, but they cannot bring themselves to a condition of mind to forgive themselves. The ministers of the gospel who have suffered most for religion and who have worked hardest in the christian vineyard feel a gloom come over their spirits when they allude to their former wicked lives before their conversion. As an example of our meaning we may mention St. Paul, the great Apostle of the Gentiles. He in the first portion of his life was a cruel and dangerous persecutor of the Church. Sometimes in his Epistles to the different Christian Churches he makes allusions to his former evil life, and whenever he does so, he seems to be full of trouble, and his regrets seem to agitate and disturb his feelings to the very depths of his heart. In one place he mentions how he kept the clothes of the men who stoned St. Stephen, the protomartyr, and consented to his death. At another account he confesses that he is the chief of sinners, and not worthy to be called an Apostle, because he persecuted the Church of Christ. When a prisoner, before king Agrippa, he goes over a part of his former life, and said, "I verily thought with myself, that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth. Which thing I also did in Jerusalem: and many of the saints did I shut up in prison, having received authority from the chief priests; and when they were put to death, I gave my voice against them. And I punished them oft in every synagogue, and compelled them to blaspheme; and being exceedingly mad against them, I persecuted them even unto strange cities." How very earnest, and yet how sad he is when now in bonds for the sake of the same Jesus of Nazareth

which before his conversion he so madly blasphemed! It is not surprising that king Agrippa, while listening to the touching incidents of his former history, and the appearance of Jesus to him on the way to Damascus, and his wonderful conversion to the christian faith, that king Agrippa said to Paul, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." And it is not at all amazing that the governor Festus, while hearing these extraordinary revelations, should cry out with a loud voice, "Paul, thou art beside thyself; much learning doth make thee mad." Paul, the persecutor, was destined to become the distinguished Apostle of the Lord Jesus to the Gentile world. God had chosen him to stand before emperors and kings, and the great men of the earth, to declare to them the salvation of mankind through Him who suffered a cruel death on Calvary. God in heaven had forgiven the sins of his former life, which he committed against the saints, and had thoroughly blotted out every former transgression. But, notwithstanding this, St. Paul himself could not forget his former persecutions, could not forgive himself the part he took in the deaths of the innocent saints. In order to atone for his persecutions of the Christian Church he determined that in time and out of time, day or night, in plenty or in want, he would as long as life lasted work as hard as he could for his Master; suffer every trial for his sake, and give up his life rejoicing for the privilege of dying for that Church he once persecuted. Of all the apostles and evangelists and martyrs of the first century, St. Paul was not behind the foremost. He worked the hardest and suffered the greatest of any christian; and at last gave up his life a martyr for his religion. When his great soul escaped from his body that soul appeared in the eternal world, and with the speed of lightning he went on to his blessed Master to throw his crown of martyrdom at

His feet, and there he begged as a great favour to be appointed an evangelist over a certain portion of the heavenly paradise, that he may continue his work of atonement in heaven, because that he once was guilty of persecuting the Church. As on earth, so in the blessed paradise above, he wishes to continue his work of uplifting those souls who are in a lower position than himself. "One star differeth from another star in glory."

It is quite a mistaken idea that the redeemed saints in glory are always singing and resting in idleness, and remain quiescent for ever. The chief delight, the greatest blessedness, the happiest moments of the heavenly inhabitants consist in work. There is not an idler in heaven. All are everlastingly employed in deeds of charity, in loving actions, in always helping to advancement those who are below them. There is among the blessed inhabitants of the heavenly Jerusalem eternal progress, everlasting advancement, constant promotion throughout all the ages of eternity; a steady elevation to higher pleasures, to purer enjoyments, to more ravishing gratifications, and that world without end. Among the lower spirits who inhabit inferior spheres there are learned missionaries, bands of faithful evangelists, mighty preachers of the word, working with all their might and strength to educate, to enlighten, and to assist their brethren in lower conditions of perfection to higher positions of glory,

When Saul of Tarsus met his gentle Saviour on his way to Damascus, to persecute the Church, and to imprison the innocent saints, that light that shone around him from heaven, that tender and beautiful voice that said to him, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?"—he will never forget; and we are of opinion that he there and then made a solemn vow that he would endeavour

with all the strength of his mind and soul, in the 'future, both in this life and the next, to undo, and atone for the cruel persecutions of his unconverted life. Of all christian ministers of the first century he worked the hardest during his earthly life, and we believe that he still works the hardest of all the saints in heaven, St. Paul is not in his true position at present in paradise, but from earnest choice, which he counted as a great privilege, he volunteered to descend to the lower spheres—to go down among less pure spirits than himself in order to lift them to a higher state of perfection, to a greater height of happiness, and to a purer bliss. The idlers in eternity are the inhabitants of hell, and yet in one sense they are not idle, for they ever shed unavailing tears; they always moan over unrepented wrongs; they continually brood over lost opportunities; they cease not to bewail sins committed in the flesh! The prisoners who live in the dark caverns of the lost are unhappy because they are idle; because they find nothing to do; and they will ever remain in this state of unhappiness until they find out, if they will ever do so, that pure happiness is the fruit that grows upon the activities of existence.

The Church of Christ, from the time she was established on earth in the land of Judea by her beloved Bridegroom to the present time, has suffered from great tribulations, generally if not always from the persecutions, the jealousies, and the robbing propensities of earthly kingdoms. In the first centuries of the christian era she suffered most woeful calamities from the ten persecutions of the Roman emperors. In the fourth and fifth centuries she suffered much from heresiarchs and internal divisions. During the dark ages she suffered from spiritual darkness, ignorance, and pride. At, and after the Reformation, and in protestant times she suffered principally from spiritual apathy and carelessness, from atheism and

infidelity, as at the time of the French revolution, when the God of heaven was banished from the throne of the universe, and a woman of impure life, representing the goddess of reason, was crowned in His stead, by legal enactment. Within the United Kingdom there have been especially in protestant times, bitter enemies of the Church. King Charles the first was a great admirer and defender of the episcopal church; but another man, who like Saul of Tarsus, at the martyrdom of St. Stephen, consented unto the death of King Charles, and afterwards called the Protector, save Oliver Cromwell. He and his cruel roundheads were her bitterest enemies. Oliver Cromwell proved himself to be one of the greatest foes that the Church ever had; he turned out clergymen from their benefices and from their homes, and committed them to prisons and to starvation. He turned the parish churches into stables for his horses, and the churchyards for their grazing plots. He gave the vacant benefices and the vacant homes of the clergy to ignorant men, such as ploughmen, thatchers, and labourers, in order to throw as much infamy and contumely upon the Church as he possibly could. It is not at all wonderful that this man after committing so many deeds of cruelty, and after desecrating the Church and her holy places, and the resting places of the dead, that he was so full of fear in the latter part of his life. In the day time he momentarily looked around in all directions, expecting to encounter foes in every place he went to. In the night time, before retiring to rest, he looked for enemies under his bed, and got up many times in the night imagining that there were murderers and assassins there seeking his life. Cromwell's latter days on earth were most miserable, and what can be his condition now in the eternal world where his cruel actions cry aloud to a God of righteousness for just retribution? Cromwell's son probably having observed

the forlorn and wretched condition of his father as Protector wisely renounced both protectorship and kingship, either of which was offered to him, preferring to live the life of a private gentleman. After the death of Oliver Cromwell the legitimate king was restored to his throne, and he at once began to set right the cruel wrongs of the Protector. He restored the clergymen who survived the cruelties of Cromwell—restored them to their homes and their benefices, and the connection between the Church and the State were re-established. The Church has been since that time to the present, at times, in very stormy weather. She has had to face bitter enemies who have attempted to damage her, and to destroy her, but all the machinations of her deadly foes have proved unsuccessful, with the exception of one branch of her. The Irish Church has been disestablished and disendowed, and partly robbed of her tithes and possessions, which have been alienated from their sacred purposes. We have no wish to speak disparagingly of the Right Honourable William Ewart Gladstone, for we hold him in great respect; nevertheless, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that he was chiefly instrumental in disestablishing and disendowing the Church in Ireland. However, it is generally believed that Mr Gladstone deeply repented the part he took in injuring the Irish Church, and it has been remarked that whatever he took in hand after disestablishing her he never succeeded in any project, never prospered in any undertaking, and never was so happy among his friends as before. We consider that Mr. Gladstone after injuring the episcopal Church of Ireland was exactly in the same condition as St. Paul the apostle after his conversion to christianity. The great apostle put forth his mightiest effort, displayed energy of the greatest exertion, and suffered hardships with the greatest perseverance, on account and for the love of that Church that he at first

persecuted and maligned. In exactly a similar way, Mr. Gladstone, after the injury he did to the Church, so deeply repented that he became its greatest defender and upholder. At the next Cabinet a plan for the destruction of the Welsh branch of the Church of England was formulated, and as a result a most infamous Bill was proposed in which the great Cathedrals of the Church were to be desecrated and made national property, the parish churches and churchyards were to be partly given over to the enemy, the tithes were to be taken possession of by the State. The utter degradation and spoliation of sacred property was fully resolved upon. When Mr. Gladstone saw these impudent proposals he stood aghast, his great soul was thoroughly stirred within him, and probably, like St. Paul, made a firm resolution to heaven that the proposed Bill, if he by any possibility could prevent it, should never pass. The day arrived when this wonderful measure was brought before the House of Commons. Mr. Gladstone, as we may imagine was present, but so well did he keep his own counsel that not a single person knew what he was going to do, what side he was going to take. Knowing what he had done to the Irish Church the friends of the Church of England were greatly afraid that contrary to the days of his youth, when he so magnificently defended the Church, he would now either leave the question untouched or perhaps be on the side of her enemies. After a while Mr. Gladstone stood up for to speak in a full house. Every eye was upon him, there was great fear manifested on the one side, and a great expectation on the other. The liberal and radical members were there in great numbers with hardly one of them absent, and the enemies of the Church were there from every part of the United Kingdom. They, with one accord, fully counted upon a glorious victory, and had no hesitation but that Mr. Gladstone would speak in favour

of their wicked plan of spoliation. But never were men so disappointed. As Mr Gladstone proceeded with his speech the smiles of jubilation observable on the faces of the radicals at the commencement was gradually giving way, and became angry and scowling countenances. In his peroration at the end of his speech Mr. Gladstone's eulogy of the Welsh Church will be remembered and quoted as long as the world shall remain. With a voice like thunder, and almost with a youthful energy, Mr. Gladstone burst forth with elocution like a running river, and said with measured sentences, brimful of inspiration, "The Welsh Church is a living Church, an advancing Church, and a rising Church from elevation to elevation, and why should a Church like this be interfered with?" Never was greater disappointment, never was there such confusion of faces, never were there such blushes of shame upon the countenances of the enemies of the Church of England. During Mr. Gladstone's days she was left alone in quietness, her destruction became a forlorn hope, her enemies were hardly able to lift up their faces. Without a doubt Mr. Gladstone on the above occasion was the means of saving the Welsh Church, and took her away in safety from between the teeth of the lions. He on this occasion atoned for the injury he did to the Irish Church. His old churchmanship of his younger days shined forth like the sun in all his future speeches, and in all his actions. It is said by some that Mr. Gladstone was never the same man after disestablishing the Irish Church as he was before. There were certain evidences of a deep and genuine repentance throughout all his future life to its very end. He appears as if he wanted to make an atonement for his treatment of the Irish branch of the Church. Until the day of his death they say that he seemed much concerned about her welfare, and in her comforting arms he breathed his last breath. When he departed from this

life to appear in the life beyond it is our opinion that, like St. Paul, he went direct to his beloved Saviour and humbly asked permission to join the great apostle of the Gentiles in his missionary work, and go down to spirits of a lower grade to assist them to ascend and rise higher. We doubt not but that St. Paul has a large and distinguished band of spirits who once lived here in the flesh. Mr. Gladstone voluntarily chose to join this band, and to assist them in this blessed undertaking. We quite believe that there are not greater friends in the whole heaven, no more earnest co-workers, no more loving companions than St. Paul and St. William Ewart Gladstone. These two great men are the two captains of the band. These two have somewhat similar feelings, namely, an intense and burning desire to make atonement for the sins of the past—St. Paul for his mad persecution of the Christian Church, St. William Gladstone for disestablishing and disendowing and doing injury to a branch of the same Church. The blessed Jesus will more easily forgive transgressions against Himself than transgressions against His Church—His beloved bride.

During the life of Mr. Gladstone the enemies of the Church kept themselves very quiet; now that he is gone there are evident signs of their revivication. The radicals, the socialists, the atheists, the infidels, the common disturbers of the peace of England have by a large majority been returned to Parliament. This hostile army seems determined to join hands and go forth to spoil, to ravage, and to destroy our beautiful country, and to thoroughly rob her of her former glory. There is much wickedness in high places; the land is full of infidels; the Holy Scriptures are banished practically from the schools. Whatever is sacred in the land is being polluted. The people are seeking the pleasures of the earth, and are

turning away by thousands from the sanctuary of the Lord. They seek once more the life of God's holy Church.

We are strongly reminded of the complaints of the prophet Elijah when he said, "I have been very jealous for the Lord God of hosts, because the children of Israel have forsaken Thy covenant, thrown down Thine altars, and slain Thy prophets with the sword; and I, even I only, am left; and they seek my life, to take it away." These complaints of the prophet are, we think, applicable to the condition of England in the present day. The Church has been very jealous for the Lord because the Government has allowed our children in our schools to be brought up as heathens. They have thrown down God's altars because school teachers are allowed to dispense with all forms of religion; they have killed the prophets by taking away every chance for the clergy to enter the schools to impart religious knowledge; and the Church herself, like Elijah, is still alive; but the State through disestablishment and robbery, and the desecration of her sacred places, is seeking her destruction. The enemies of the Church are awakening, show signs of activity, are becoming most aggressive, and by all appearances are going to attempt to injure her. We have already shown that demons had taken possession of the heart of Judas Iscariot, and influenced him to commit the chiefest of sins—the betrayal of the blessed Saviour, and also how they were condemned to closer imprisonment for about two thousand years, and that some of them are already released, and have chosen to come here to this world once more to assist in similar works of iniquity, but it is not killing the Saviour himself this time, but to kill His Church. We have the blessed assurance from the lips of the blessed Lord Himself that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against her." This promise has been her great comfort throughout the past generations, and will be her comfort

in the future. We sometimes doubt whether the unholy throng of radicals, socialists, and infidels, together with the assistance and influence of all the demons that assisted Judas to betray his Lord, will dare to try this foolish attempt. They may be able to cripple her, rob her, degrade her, humiliate her, but not as long as her Bridegroom sitteth on the right hand of His Father will they ever destroy her. How absurd, how foolish, how preposterous, is a Government to show and feel animosity towards the Church. There are only two supreme powers in a country, and these are the State and the Church. Between these two there must of necessity be some kind of relationship. This relationship again must be one of friendship or of animosity. It cannot possibly be otherwise. Our Lord has made a statement "Whosoever is not with Me is against Me." There cannot be a feeling of indifference, or a state of neutrality. No two powers can exist in a country independently of each other. If the State possesses a friendly feeling towards the Church, and the Church likewise possesses a feeling of friendship towards the State, then they are like Moses and Aaron, loving brothers. If on the other hand the State feels animosity towards the Church, the result would be persecution, cruelty, robbery, and degradation of the Church by the State. We reiterate that these two principal powers of a christian kingdom ought to be most friendly and loving towards each other. There must be perfect understanding between them, and perfect knowledge of their duties, and each ought to allow the other to perform its relative duties. It is the duty of the State to protect its subjects from foreign foes, to make just laws, and to administer those laws for the chief benefit and chief comfort of all its people. It is the duty of the Church to instruct the subjects of a kingdom in the Holy Scriptures, which contain their duties to God and to their fellow men;

to show them the way of life, and how to be happy in this world and in the world to come. The State and the Church ought, like brothers, to do their own proper work. The State ought to do its own work and freely to give loving permission to the Church to do her own work also. A very little consideration is necessary to convince us that the State whether from jealousy or from a desire for the retention of authority in its own hands has been doing, and is at present doing, work that ought to be done by the Church herself. As these two powers of State and Church are practically exercised by Parliament and Convocation it will be more pertinent to our purpose if we make use of these names rather than the other. Parliament as its first duty ought to give full power to Convocation to rule the Church. After doing this Parliament's second great duty is to transfer to Convocation all the duties that naturally devolve upon Convocation, such as the appointments of bishops, dignitaries, and clergymen. It is a most cruel action on the part of Parliament to perform duties which most legitimately belong to the Church herself. This is the reason that Nonconformists cry out so loudly against the connection between Church and State, but this connection is not the culprit but the fact that Ministers of State discharge duties that belong to Convocation. The connection between them cannot be severed, but what is wanted is that Parliament should be careful to discharge its own duties and allow Convocation to do the same. There is no need of jealousy, or robbery, or humiliation. Such works would savour of persecution and cruelty. It is most remarkable that the present Parliament, which consists of a very large number of Nonconformists, that one of them should not bring forward a Bill to compel Parliament to give up all Church patronage to Convocation. This would in their view settle for ever the connection between Church and State.

Before Parliament can be called upon to transfer matters that concern the Church to the Church, it is necessary first of all to reform Convocation. Parliament should allow it to become a living assembly with power to govern the Church. It is hard to say whether Parliament or Convocation should commence first the work of reformation. We cannot conceive any difficulty if Convocation began to reform itself, and after doing this it should approach Parliament to grant it the power of self-government. The first reform of Convocation should be to become united. At present there are two Convocations, one of Canterbury and the other of York. This fact is, we consider it, a sad reflection upon the wisdom of churchmen, and it is to be hoped that immediate agreement between the two should take place, and a settlement that in future only one Convocation should exist. After this is done it should be made truly representative of the whole Church. Every clergyman of whatever rank, and every member, male and female, of the Church should have votes to send representatives to Convocation. We would gladly see the name changed and both powers called, one the civil Parliament, and the other the ecclesiastical or Church Parliament. Among christian men the reforms that we have already mentioned ought to become a fact without any revolution in the State or in the Church. The mismanagement of centuries has brought her to such a condition of inertness, of drowsiness, and of indifference, that at present we will find it a difficult task to awake her out of sleep. However, let the work be commenced with Convocation, and all other necessary reforms will follow in its train. We are prepared to encounter opposition, to meet with difficulties, to find many obstacles in the way, like the father bringing his son possessed with a devil to the disciples to ask them to cast the evil spirit out of the lad, but they could not. Afterwards they inquired of the

Master, why were we unable to cast him out. His answer was that this sort will not be driven out except by fasting and prayer. The hindrances of so many kinds against Church reform are so powerful, so many privileges must be swept away, so many ancient rights must be given up, that the reform we require will not be granted except by fasting and prayer. The disciples will not succeed; we must get the divine Master Himself to come down among us and cast out these demons of rights and privileges that even good men seem to hold so precious. All the members of the Church throughout the kingdom must agree to fall upon their knees and with one accord to fervently send their prayers to heaven and ask the holy Saviour of mankind to send the breath of heaven down to blow from the four winds and to breathe upon the Church apparently dead that she may revive and live. If we could only succeed to get the members of the Church generally to exert themselves by fasting and prayer, and ask for the divine influences to enter the hearts of christian men generally, we would see the Church at one bound springing into a new life and a new power and a new energy, forth to the world conquering and to conquer the nations and the kingdoms and the world to Christ and to God.



CHAPTER III.

CHURCH REFORM NECESSARY.

This subject we readily confess is one of great difficulty, and some would say a subject containing the germs of great danger. But however great the danger may be, we, nevertheless, are quite sure that reforms, great and many, are required in every department of the Church. Bishops ought to be multiplied, their presence in the House of Lords is not absolutely necessary. Without seats in the House of Lords they could live on half or less than half their present incomes. Bishops should be appointed deans of their own cathedrals; canonaries should be abolished, and chaplains under the bishops should be appointed to perform the cathedral services. The powers of the bishops should be considerably diminished. Two Convocations are quite unnecessary and should be joined together and be made one in which representatives of the Church of England—clergy and laity—should be members and have full powers to govern and rule the Church, as parliament rules all the people of the kingdom. The Prayer Book ought to undergo a thorough revision, and powers given to the clergy to change, shorten, and curtail the services as circumstances may dictate. A great central fund should be called into existence in every diocese, and men of real talent and genuine piety ought to be assisted at the grammar schools, the universities, and the colleges, and every inducement should be held out to Nonconformists to return to the Church of their fathers. However, it is not our object to write on reforms in the Church generally but to confine ourselves to one only, but that one of great importance,

and one which calls for reform perhaps more than any other, namely, that of church patronage. We intend to consider the appointments to the different offices of the Church pretty minutely, and will commence with the appointments of bishops to their dioceses.

We have already touched lightly upon the subject of the connection that should exist between the State and the Church, and we have shown that this connection between them ought to be of a most friendly character. There ought to be a complete understanding between them as to their relative duties. The State ought to be loving and kind, and ready at all times to help the Church; and the Church, on the other hand, as Aaron was to Moses, always ready to assist, to obey, and to pray for the State on all occasions and in every emergency. The Church without any doubt ought to be allowed the power to govern herself. The State grants this privilege to the Roman Catholic Church, to the Wesleyan Conference, and to the Nonconformist Churches, and there is no reason whatever that the State should not allow the same privilege to the Church of England. There is no difficulty in any way to find out the legitimate and respective duties of the State and the Church if we only consider the objects for which each of them exists. Every institution has one great and primary object for its existence. A civil government exists for the purpose of defending the lives, the properties, and the happiness of its subjects, to administer its laws with impartiality and equity and with the strictest honesty. If a State does not perform these duties it loses the primary object of its existence. The Church is an institution established for the purpose of instructing, enlightening, and persuading men everywhere to live pure, truthful, and honest lives in the present world and to daily prepare themselves in accordance with the doctrines of the christian religion for a life of eternal blessedness in the

world beyond the grave. In order to show more clearly still the relative duties of the State and the Church we may mention that all the duties of a State are included within the line of a circle, and all the duties of the Church are also included within the line of a circle. Now, as long as both perform their duties strictly within their proper and legitimate boundaries each will be working most harmoniously and most happily. But should the State leave its own boundary and trespass upon the boundary of the Church then there will be confusion, persecution, and injustice. When this should take place the State would not be acting in accordance with the primary object of its existence, for the State exists for the purpose of defending the rights of all its subjects. But when the State persists to trespass upon the Church and do the work which belongs to the Church it sacrifices its primary object. We maintain that when the State refuses to grant permission to the Church to govern herself it acts directly contrary to the object of its existence.

When the State appoints bishops for the Christian Church it actually trespasses upon sacred grounds, goes beyond the boundary of the circle within which all its activities should be confined. The King of England and the Lord High Chancellor of England are bound by England's laws to profess the christian religion and be members of the Protestant Church ; but it is not so in the case of prime ministers. This state official is in some respects the most powerful person in the kingdom. It is these prime ministers who have the power to appoint bishops for the Christian Church. But these most powerful persons are not restricted in any way whatever as far as Protestantism or profession of any religion is concerned in their freedom. A prime minister of England may be a Jew, a Mahomedan, a Deist, an Atheist, or a member of any other religion, and hence we are face to face with this

absolute absurdity that an Atheist is allowed the power of appointing Christian bishops. The actual fact of such an appointment has not as yet actually occurred, but there exists the possibility, and even the probability, and at any time in the near future the probability may become actual occurrence.

What a disgrace it would be for the Church that her bishops should be appointed by infidels. It is no wonder when we find these absurdities possible that the Roman Catholic Church should charge the Church of England with being an Erastian Church, and that some other christians put the whole blame upon the connection which exists between the State and the Church, and that on this account this connection between them should not exist. The fault cannot be attributed to this connection, but to the fact that the State is trespassing upon the Church and insists to perform duties that should be performed by the Church herself. These men who throw the whole blame upon the connection between the State and the Church are most erroneous in their opinions. As we have shown before, and we can now repeat the same truth, that a connection between the State and the Church either friendly or inimical must exist between them. In the nature of things it could not be otherwise. No State could ever suffer an independent institution to exist within its boundaries. It must take cognizance of any power, and measure carefully the nature of every society or institution within the kingdom, for fear that their existence may be prejudicial to its interest. Self preservation is the first law of nature, and this law applies to kingdoms as well as to persons. It is a most surprising eventuality that the radical statesmen of England should not interfere when a radical Prime Minister exercises the power of appointing a bishop to a diocese. It is believed that there are about two hundred Nonconformist members

in the present House of Commons. Is there not one of them courageous enough to bring forward a Bill to transfer all the Church patronage of the Crown, Lord Chancellors, Prime Ministers, and all other civil officials to the Church herself, to whom all legitimate appointments in the Church of a right belongs? When Church appointments are made by prime ministers the primary object is sacrificed to a secondary object. The primary object in the appointment of a bishop should be that the person selected should be a godly, an upright, and a fit man in every respect to occupy the position of a bishop, and that the patron should have a single eye in the appointment to the success of the Church and the glory of God. Would any one have the hardihood to say that prime ministers as a rule possess these qualifications which would enable them to choose the most suitable men for bishops? Are not these selections made generally by civil officials on account of friendship, or the exigences of party or other political influences, and that fitness for the office would be a remote idea with them in these appointments? The primary objects are without a doubt sacrificed on these occasions to secondary objects. This reform in the appointments of bishops by prime ministers cry aloud to heaven for redress. We find that not only bishops are the only persons appointed by State officials but also deans, canons, and other beneficed clergymen. These appointments, also in exactly the same manner as bishops, are made not on account of a fitness in the successful candidates but generally on account of friendships and political recommendations. We know of many such appointments that have brought shame and discredit upon the persons concerned in them, and which have been detrimental to the welfare of the Church in these parishes. There are other kinds of patrons beside civil officials which are called private patrons. Many noblemen and

private gentlemen and even ladies frequently possess the power of appointing clergymen to parishes on account of possessing estates in these parishes and the appointment of clergymen to benefices are attached to many estates. There may be some exceptions, but it is almost the invariable rule with private patrons to appoint friends or relatives, or on the recommendations of friends. Suitability is hardly thought of, and to the extent that fitness to discharge the duties of the parish is neglected to the same extent is the welfare of the parish sacrificed. We have yet other public patrons to consider which are probably more numerous than all the others, namely, the bishops. In all the dioceses in England, and especially in Wales, episcopal patronage is much larger than lay patronage. The power to appoint clergymen as deans, canons, archdeacons, chancellors, rural deans, and clergymen generally to benefices is a most important one, in fact infinitely too important to be entrusted to any single individual, whoever he is, and of whatever character he may be. The clergy as a class are the most learned body of men in the kingdom, and among twenty to thirty thousand educated persons we will find a great variety of talent, of wisdom, of knowledge, of suitability, and of tact. Among the ranks of the clergy also there would be found a variety of circumstances; some of them are rich, and some of them are poor; some of them are bachelors, and some of them are married; some of them have no families, and some of them have families; some of them have only a few children, and others have many children; some of them have good tempers, and others have bad tempers; some of them are eccentric, and others of them agreeable; some of them are discreet, and others of them are foolish. We once knew of a congregation which had a very remarkable opinion of their curate, and they thought he was a fool in the pulpit and a fop out of it. We are afraid

that there are many like him in the Church in the present day. There would also be as much difference in the parishes as there is among the clergy. and how can one man deal with appointments when both clergy and parishes differ so much? To satisfy the desires and to please the feelings of a learned class, like that of the clergy, would be much too difficult and too great a task for only one individual. On account of this impossibility to give satisfaction to the clergymen of a whole diocese we would wish to emphasize with all the power we possess the tremendous importance of clerical appointments. We have already touched upon the subject of the appointments of bishops. It is hoped that a reform will soon be realized. They are appointed by civil authority, and generally for political reasons. We are quite sure that the most godly, the most wise, or the most suitable are not always appointed, and more frequently than otherwise they are made on minor considerations. When we take these two facts together, namely, the great importance of clerical appointments, and the appointments of men as bishops who are not the most wise men, nor the most suitable, we are bound to come to the most reasonable conclusion that to give the power of appointing clergymen to benefices to bishops is a most dangerous proceeding, and must bring disaster upon the Church.

For the following reasons bishops ought not to be given any clerical appointments :

It is not good nor beneficial to bishops themselves. As long as the present system of patronage exists bishops ought to be most careful in their appointments, to have chiefly in view the primary object of putting the best qualified clergymen in the most suitable parishes. If this is not done the Church in these parishes must inevitably suffer, and this is very frequently the case. When a new bishop arrives as a stranger in his diocese he will be

ignorant of the capacity, the characteristics, and the qualifications of the clergy. He may require a new dean, and of necessity he must make diligent and careful inquiries to find the man whom he wants. We can venture to take it as granted that he will not appoint the most straight-forward, the most learned, the most upright, nor yet the most successful parish priest, but the man whom he can mould most easily to his own liking, the most pliable, the most obsequious; the man that is likely to be on his own side in all circumstances. When again he appoints arch-deacons and canons they will be men who most nearly approach to the character of the dean. The prebendaries, the rural deans, and even the parish priests follow suit. They are, all of them, men of the same type; probably there will not be an independent, courageous and fearless man among them. When a bishop surrounds himself with such men so like each other, all of them that will bend to the will of their master, for he can now rule them just as he likes. The great effect of this upon the bishops themselves is that they become proud, arrogant, high in their own estimation and ridiculously consequential. They expect all the clergy, from the highest to the lowest, to cringe, to submit, to meanly bow before them; they expect this from men who are their equal in everything, and superior to them in many things. If any of the clergy dare to show independency of mind, a little self-respect, and an unwillingness to become parasites, the whip of patronage will be used upon their backs, and unless they fall into line like the rest they will be refused promotion to which they are justly entitled, perhaps as long as they live. This terrible power given to bishops over their clergy spoils them completely, and has a most destructive effect upon the whole Church. Not only does this power of patronage spoil the bishops, but it also has a most detrimental effect upon the

clergy. When the bishops wield such power as they possess in having practically to appoint clergymen to benefices the clergy are tempted to become flatterers, parasitical and sychophantic. They are men who must depend upon their bishops for promotion, and there is a strong desire in them, which is perfectly natural, to become incumbents. Since the power of appointing clergymen to incumbencies is in the hands of the bishops they are strongly tempted to cringe and humiliate themselves overmuch, for there is a danger if they show a particle of an independent spirit, or an attitude or manner which a bishop might consider obtrusive, this may risk his chance of promotion for a lifetime, hence the great temptation to the clergy of wallowing too much in the dust of humiliation. This power, which bishops consider so valuable to themselves, and to which they cling so tenaciously, is, nevertheless, frequently the cause of rendering them most unpopular. We freely grant that the proper distribution of patronage is a most difficult performance. When sometimes desirable benefices become vacant there will be a very large number of applicants for them.

We are reminded of a benefice which became vacant recently, and we were told that not less than eighty-four clergymen applied for it. Each applicant had strong expectations that he would be successful. Human nature is the same in all men, and we cannot expect the clergy to be different from others. Men are partial to themselves, and in comparing themselves with others they think they possess a fitness, a particular qualification, a peculiar adaptation which would commend them to the bishop in preference of the other competitors. Every one of these applicants owing to this partiality towards themselves will strongly believe that he will be the successful candidate. The patron can only give it to one applicant, and must of

necessity disappoint eighty-three. When the name of the successful clergyman becomes known there will arise a cry throughout the diocese of dissatisfaction and disappointment. Though the bishop had actually made the best appointment possible according to the opinion of impartial judges, but on account of this partiality for self that we have already mentioned the bishop will be blamed and abused and found fault with most unmercifully, and these eighty-three disappointed candidates will consider themselves cruelly and harshly treated, and will feel highly and even wrathfully displeased with their bishop. This one appointment will result in the bishop making one friend and eighty-three enemies. Let us suppose that such cases should frequently occur, the bishop in a few years would be the best hated man in the diocese. We find our surmises turning out to be actual facts in the generality of cases. When a bishop has resided for many years in a diocese and at last dies there would hardly be a clergyman that would attend his funeral or shed a tear over his grave with the exception perhaps of a few personal friends and some few parasites. We have already noticed that the distribution of patronage according to the present system is a most difficult performance. There are so many and various claims set forth by different clergymen for preferment. Some will claim promotion on account of seniority, some on account of suitability, some on account of having large families, some on account of poverty, some on account of friendship, some on account of their success in the ministry, some on account of their scholarship, some on account of recommendations of friends, some on account of their preaching abilities, and many others on account of a host of other claims. How is it possible for one individual patron to satisfy all these hungry men with bread in the wilderness (the Church has only few loaves and fishes to give)? We are bound to

grant that the above are all legitimate claims, but it is quite impossible for a single patron to do it, hence our contention that the system of patronage is altogether at fault. Of all the abuses that we find in the Church, and there are many, there are none more corrupt, more cruel, and more damaging to her success than this system of patronage. We have yet only mentioned of appointments that are made by bishops who have a genuine desire to make just, careful, and correct appointments, and if we find these so utterly unsatisfactory what can we say of the appointments made by bishops who are partial, unjust, and careless, depending upon the recommendations of their friends, who as irresponsible persons generally recommend their friends and relatives, and in this way the greatest blunders imaginable are made, even destroying for many years the progress of the Church in these parishes to which unsuitable men are appointed? We have no hesitation in emphatically and thoroughly condemning this corrupt system as one which injures and spoils and ruins our beloved Church, and we earnestly pray for her sake for a speedy, thorough, and complete reform. The bishops without a doubt will fight to the death against this reform, for by it they assume a power which they use with great authority over the clergy, and by it also they get their respect and deference. But we maintain in the face of the sun that this power of patronage in the hands of individuals is an unjust power, breeding a sham and hypocritical respect and a mean deference which is not after a godly sort. In the next chapter we propose a plan of Church appointments which we think will give universal satisfaction.



CHAPTER IV.

A PLAN OF CHURCH REFORM PROPOSED.

We have seen in the last chapter that a reform of the Church is necessary. It is not our intention to write on the different subjects which loudly call for reform in the Christian Church, which no doubt are greatly wanted, but the subject of this chapter will be that of Church patronage. The present system we have weighed in the balances and has been found to be so unsatisfactory that we do not think we shall find much difficulty in proposing a system infinitely better than the one we have at present. In our proposed plan of Church patronage we must take into account first the relationship that exists between the Church and the State. This relationship is at present in a very unsatisfactory condition. Whether this reform which we now shall propose will begin with the State or with the Church is difficult to determine, and as far as this is concerned it is not very important which of them will commence it. The fact of its being commenced by one or the other is the one of importance, for we consider this to be the foundation of Church reform, and without it no other great reform in the Church is possible. These two leading powers in a kingdom, the State and the Church, ought to come to a better understanding with each other. The State should strictly confine itself within its own dominion and do only its own civil work. The Church should also keep within her own boundary and perform her own sacred duties. The State should not encroach upon the Church nor should the Church encroach

upon the State. Centuries ago, in pre-reformation times, the Church went over her own proper boundary into the boundary of the State, and presumed to give laws to emperors and kings and parliaments, and considered herself much the higher power of the two. Since the Protestant reformation the State has sometimes persecuted and robbed and cruelly treated the Church. Henry the Eighth threw off foreign bondage and would not allow the Pope to continue his authority over his kingdom of England, and the king took to himself the power previously held by the Pope, and it is the remains of this power that has remained and to this day is held by the parliament of England. We cannot cease to wonder that some member of parliament during these many generations has not brought in a measure to parliament to propose that all civil officials should give back to the Church all that belongs to her, and to give up all Church appointments that the Church herself might do her own work. It is absolutely necessary before the reforms we are now going to propose that the Church should have the power of self-government. The two great powers of the State and the Church should be assimilated and made like each other in their government as much as possible. The State has its parliament, an assembly representing all the constituencies of the whole kingdom. Here they make laws, and after making them they have full power over their administration. The Church also ought to have her parliament, or her Convocation made into a parliament. Every Church member should possess a vote by which representatives of the whole Church should be sent to Convocation, which should have full power to make laws for the Church, and also should have authority to administer these laws. These two great powers, possessing a true feeling of brotherhood, should rule—one the earthly kingdom and the other the kingdom of heaven.

The earthly kingdom by the law of righteous dealing should willingly allow every necessary power to the Church to take care of her own affairs. The Church should have her own parliament, with as full a representation as we find existing in the civil parliament. There should also be two houses in the Church parliament, as we find in the civil parliament, in which a certain number of representative bishops and an equal number of representative lay-noblemen should sit in an upper house, and which we may call the Church House of Lords. Also there should be a Church House of Commons, containing representatives of the whole Church. The State is the first and chief power in a kingdom, for we find that Moses always exercised a greater power than his brother Aaron. Convocation, or the Church parliament, should always be willing to act in subordination to it, and take the second place. After the relationship between the State and the Church should be put upon a proper basis, and their functions rightly adjusted, all Church patronage now in the hands of the civil government should be transferred to the Church parliament, and the Church House of Lords should henceforth appoint all the bishops. A board of patronage should be established in each diocese with full power to appoint deans, archdeacons, chancellors, canons, and beneficed clergymen, with proper officials to do the clerical work, such as secretaries, treasurers and clerks. However, with regard to appointments to benefices, a committee should be selected from the members of the board of patronage, as well as representatives from the vacant parish, chosen by the votes of all Church members in the parish. Also two should represent the archdeaconry in which the parish is situate, and another two representing the diocese. A plan of this kind would prove most advantageous to the Church. By having representatives of the vacant parish, the archdeaconry, and the

diocese, there could not be any fault found with the appointment. At present, when one individual appoints all the clergy of the neighbourhood, one would find fault with it on account of the partiality or the friendship of the patron, and the result will be jealousies, back-bitings, and animosities between the unsuccessful applicants. The appointment and the induction of a new incumbent to a parish ought to be considered a time of great importance, and should be well advertised. Not only should the whole parish be cordially invited to attend at the induction, but hundreds from all the neighbouring parishes should also attend, with the choirs of the different churches. The induction day and the following should be kept as festival days, and the services should include sermons from masters of the pulpit, and congregational singing. If only we could get a reform of this kind the advent of a new incumbent to a parish would be a time of great spiritual rejoicing. Every member of the Church and of the surrounding churches would feel that he was a living member of the great universal Church. The bishops would become as other men; they would not be feared or flattered as they are at the present time. They would be respected, endeared, and loved only for their genuine kindness, for their deeds of charity, and for their undoubted piety, and never afterwards as earthly caterers of the loaves and fishes of the Church. The jealousies among the clergy would be at an end for all Church appointments would be made by representative boards of patronage which would give universal satisfaction.

O God, the Father of heaven, bless, guide, and defend thy holy Church from her cruel enemies; from robbers of her sacred property, and from all who wish to injure her. O Lord, revive Thy work in the midst of the years, in the midst of the years make known; in wrath remember mercy, O Lord; enable Thy holy Church to

awake out of sleep, the sleep of generations. Awake, awake, put on thy strength. O Zion, put on thy beautiful garments. O Jerusalem, the holy city, for henceforth there shall not more come into thee the uncircumcised, and the unclean. Shake thyself from the dust; arise, and sit down. O Jerusalem, loose thyself from the bands of thy neck, O captive daughter of Zion. For Zion's sake I will not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth. Rejoice ye with Jerusalem, and be glad with her all ye that love her; rejoice for joy with her all ye that mourn for her, that ye may suck and be satisfied with the breasts of her consolations; that ye may milk out and be delighted with the abundance of her glory. For thus saith the Lord, "Behold I will extend peace to her like the river, and the glory of the Gentiles like a flowing stream."

O Lord keep Thy Church in perpetual safety. Help,
O Lord, Thy people to strive against their foes.

Christian! dost thou see them,
On the holy ground,
How the troops of Midian
Prowl and prowl around?
Christian! up and smite them,
Counting gain but loss,
Smite them by the merit
Of the holy Cross.



NOTES

ON

NEWELL CONNOP THIRLWALL, LORD BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S.

Bishop Connop Thirlwall, as he is generally called, occupied the See of St. David's for thirty-four years—from 1840 to 1874. Bishop Thirlwall was a man who possessed a great intellect, was a powerful thinker, a well-known scholar, and a distinguished linguist. He was born in London in the year 1797. In his boyhood he was a scholar at the Charterhouse. He entered Trinity College, Cambridge, at the age of seventeen, and was elected scholar of Trinity. He won the Bell and Craven Scholarship, the Chancellor's Medal, and was 22nd Senior Optime. He was elected Fellow of Trinity in 1818; entered Lincoln's Inn in the year 1820, and was called to the Bar in 1825. In about two years afterwards he abandoned the law and returned to Cambridge with the intention of seeking Holy Orders. He was ordained deacon in the year 1827, and priest in the following year. In the year 1832 he became assistant tutor at Trinity College, but about this time he wrote a pamphlet containing very advanced opinions, and on account of these opinions he was obliged to give up his tutorship. In the same year that he did so he was appointed by Lord Brougham to the benefice of Kirkby Underdale. While rector of the above parish he found sufficient time to write his History of Greece, which was considered a standard work for years. However, by this time it has been superseded by other writers who have more recently written

the History of Greece. He was appointed by the prime minister, Lord Melbourne, in the year 1840, bishop of St. David's, and continued to preside over this diocese until his death, in 1874. It is not our intention in these Notes to give a full history of Bishop Thirlwall, but to delineate his general character as seen in his administration of St. David's.

The general characteristics of him and his special idiosyncrasies that will be touched upon are the following :

His pride.

His taciturnity.

His religious views.

His distribution of patronage.

His temper.

His most delightful occupation.

The writer of these Notes had opportunities to know Bishop Thirlwall, probably better than most other clergymen in the diocese, for he corresponded with him frequently on different subjects, and received from him from time to time about fifty letters. About ten years before the bishop's death the writer published a book on Prayer, in which it is shown that answers are vouchsafed to prayer under all circumstances, and that in accordance with the laws of nature, and that no impediment could arise to prevent the answers, either from providence, or destiny, or from predestination. We were of opinion that if the doctrine of prayer could be explained with sufficient clearness to the understanding and capacity of the generality of christians, and that answers according to natural laws would certainly be granted to every petition without exception, according to its quality, its strength, and its earnestness, faith in prayer would receive much strength and encouragement, and the Church in our opinion would derive benefit thereby. After the publication of the book

we sent a copy to the bishop in the hope that if he approved of its contents he would publish a favorable review of it, and recommend it to the diocese. We had a long correspondence with him upon several subjects and doctrines treated of in the book, and the discussion did not always proceed very smoothly. Connop Thirlwall was a bishop, and we a simple, unpretentious curate; and we have no doubt that he took a mean advantage of his position, and perhaps considered that it was a great presumption on the part of a small curate to argue different points with him, the great Bishop Thirlwall of St. David's! We, however, took no umbrage at his conduct, and treated him as we would treat any other man, and when he saw this he treated us with more tenderness after a while. We had occasion to call his attention at times to the opinions of Sir James Hamilton, Dr. Dugald Stewart, and Dr. Brown of Edinburgh, but we soon found out that he did not think very highly of the Scotch philosophers and metaphysicians, and preferred the philosophy that emanated from Germany. In this he was most unfair. He was too proud to condescend to read Scotch philosophy, and we have every reason to think that he had never read the great work of Dr. Brown on Mental Philosophy. The works of Dr. Brown on Mental and Moral Science have never been superseded, and they are a standing proof to this day that no philosopher has arisen in any country of greater mental calibre than the great Dr. Brown, of Scotland. After the discussion between the bishop and ourself came to an end we found his correspondence and his criticisms so worthless that we never gave them publicity. We have no wish to disparage the abilities of Bishop Thirlwall, for there is no doubt that he had great capabilities, and no one can blame us if we portray him strictly as we personally found him, for most of this portraiture are personal recollections, without

exaggeration, favourable or unfavourable, of him. We will now proceed with our remarks upon his characteristics and idiosyncracies, and will bring examples to prove all our contentions.

I.—BISHOP THIRLWALL'S PRIDE. All who knew Bishop Thirlwall would be of the same opinion as we are, that he was one of the proudest men that ever lived. This pride of his appeared most conspicuously in his isolation. He would not allow anyone to approach him. He had so many opportunities of coming in contact with his clergy, with candidates for Holy Orders, with noblemen and gentlemen throughout the diocese, and with committees in the town of Carmarthen and other places, but it was impossible; he kept aloof from all men; he would not come near any human being; he stood alone in the world, and never fraternised on equal terms with his best friends. He was however fond of animals, and fed every day when at home his swans in his grounds, and when in London he went very frequently to the Zoological Gardens to throw biscuits to the gazelle which belonged to a certain lady in the county of Carmarthen. He evidently appeared to care more for animals than for men. He would resent the approach of men, and kept them all at arm's length. He dwelt as a misanthrope would, somewhere up in the skies, in an imaginary mansion in the clouds, and would not condescend to come down to the earth and mix with his fellow beings. This great isolation of Bishop Thirlwall deceived almost everybody, the clergy, the laity, and men generally, for they naturally concluded that his aloofness, his loneliness, and his pride, were marks of greatness. People would talk to one another whenever Bishop Thirlwall appeared. "What a great man he is, what a scholar, what a profound thinker," whereas if he did come down from his dwelling place in the clouds, and

conversed and talked and made himself familiar with them. they would soon discover that he was only a man, an ordinary man, and nothing superior to other human beings around him.

II.—BISHOP TRIPLWALL'S TACITURNITY. His sermons were delivered most slowly and deliberately. His speeches were generally short. He hardly opened his mouth in either public or private company. He seldom dined with the candidates for Holy Orders at Abergwili. In his inductions of clergymen to benefices, and in the licensing of curates to their curacies, hardly a word was spoken by him of encouragement, or of advice, or any expression wishing them success in their parishes. When he met any acquaintances on railway platforms, in his walks, or in going or coming from meetings, his greetings were cold and formal, and engaged in the shortest of conversations, or more generally dismissed them with a lukewarm bow. What a splendid opportunity presented itself when there were twenty or thirty young gentlemen at the palace, coming to pass their examinations for deacons' and priests' orders to talk to them, to advise them, to encourage them, to show kindness to them which they would never forget; but no, he would do nothing of the kind. He seldom or ever asked incumbents about their parishes, nor about their difficulties, nor about their successes. He would not by any chance ask a curate how he liked his curacy, or if his sphere of labour was agreeable to him. It would have been a great encouragement to young gentlemen at the commencement of their ministry if their bishop showed a sympathetic spirit, and felt an interest in their welfare. But it would be labour in vain to expect anything of the kind from him. He rather left the impression upon anyone coming in contact with him that to open his mouth to speak a few words would be to him a most painful operation. We remember him on one

occasion, when we had gone to Abergwili palace to be licensed to a curacy. We were four curates in all, and were ushered into the usual licensing room. After a short interval the bishop enters the room. He does not offer to shake hands with us, nor utter a word of greeting, not even a Good morning. There is not anything like a smile on his face, but a scowl. He only gave us a curt bow. He remained in the room during the ceremony of licensing and appeared ill at ease because the registrar did not get on with his task more expeditiously. After completion of the licensing he gave us another short bow and at once disappeared. It is a fact worth recording, for probably such conduct had never been witnessed before or after, except at Abergwili Palace, in the days of Bishop Connop Thirlwall, that he did not open his mouth to utter a syllable from the moment he came into the room until the time he left it. One of the curates had come from the diocese of Oxford, and had a letter of introduction from Bishop Wilberforce to the Bishop of St David's. The curate mentioned that he had such a letter which he handed to the registrar, who delivered it to the bishop. His lordship received it, but still kept silence, and did not vouchsafe a word of welcome to the stranger. After leaving the palace we had a conversation about the incivility and rudeness of the man. The gentleman from Oxford made the remark that he could not have believed such a conduct possible, especially when he had a letter of introduction from such a celebrated bishop as that of Wilberforce. Whether he considered himself so much above other men, and thought it too much of a condescension to notice ordinary curates, or he had some other reason for such extraordinary behaviour we cannot possibly imagine. We remember him on another occasion, when he was holding a confirmation at St. Paul's Church, Llanelly. He was in the vestry putting on his vestment. He

was alone when we entered the vestry and offered him a helping hand. When we entered he did not open his lips to say a word, nor did he even give a bow, but he had the usual scorn on his face. The incumbent gave us a hint to come to him. As we approached he made the remark, "leave him by himself; he does not want any of us to be with him." After the confirmation was over he was leaving the vestry to go to the carriage which was going to take him to the station. The incumbent was walking by his side to the gate of the churchyard, and we also thought it was our duty to walk with him on the other side, but we regretted it many a hundred times afterwards. When he had entered the carriage he naturally shook hands with the incumbent, but instead of shaking hands with us he looked at us with what we imagined a fierce scowl, with an expression of face which clearly indicated, "do you think I am going to shake hands with a little curate like you?" And he did not. We thank heaven that all bishops are not so proud, or so rude, as Connop Thirlwall.

III.—BISHOP THIRLWALL'S RELIGIOUS OPINIONS.

He seldom preached except at the opening of new churches, and the building of new churches was far from being frequent in his day. When he did preach his sermons were very ordinary and superficial, and no one could detect, therefore, from his sermons what he believed. He wrote very little if any upon the great topics of the day. We remember once talking to his nephew, who was the registrar of the diocese. We made the remark, "Is it not remarkable that your uncle, who is a great scholar and a great linguist, has not written some great work on theology that would create a sensation in the kingdom." The nephew in answer said, "Perhaps it is, but I do not think he will print anything now in his lifetime, after his death I have no doubt he will leave something behind him that will astonish the world." Probably like

many others we were expecting after his death the book or books that were to astonish the world. After a long expectation we saw no signs that the prophecy of the nephew was to be fulfilled. However, after a long time there appeared a volume of Welsh sermons. After reading them, we conscientiously consider them dry, ordinary, uninteresting, and sermons that would not be read a second time by anyone with the object of profiting by their second perusal. There never was a greater disappointment in the religious world than to find the volume that was to astonish the world, the book containing the fruit of the brains of a man of gigantic intellect, the great Connop Thirlwall of St. David's, that all the mental remains of the scholar of European fame, as some of his admirers desired to describe him, should result in a small publication of thirteen ordinary Welsh sermons. We do not doubt that Bishop Thirlwall was a great linguist, but it would take a long time for any one to persuade us that a great linguist is necessarily a clever man. We have found men in Switzerland and other parts of the continent of Europe who could easily, especially with including provincialisms and dialects, speak a dozen languages, and they were men who were not considered extraordinary intelligent. The knowledge of languages does not prove that a man possesses great mental power, and it does not, but to a very small extent, enhance and enlarge our circle of information. If we consider the English word "bread" in this one language we have every information about bread that we need have. If we know this word in twelve different languages it is bread after all, and though we can give twelve names to it we know nothing more about it than we do by one name. The knowledge of languages is more the result of memory than any of the other powers of the mind. We must not forget that Bishop Thirlwall delivered charges to his clergy once in every three years.

Since he occupied the throne of St. David's—thirty-four years—he must have delivered about ten charges in all. We have read some of them, and listened to more at the time they were delivered. We do not remember having read any criticisms upon them, but we have heard most eulogistic remarks made by some of the clergy in their post-prandial speeches when the bishop was present. These clergy knew well how to please the bishop, for he was proverbially susceptible to flattery. We remember that on one occasion we were summoned by a citation to attend the bishop's visitation at Carmarthen, when he delivered his charge at St. Peter's Church. In his charge on this occasion he created an emphatic impression upon all the clergy present when he made certain remarks about belief. What the bishop said was this, "That a man is no more accountable or responsible for his belief or religious opinions than he is for any physical infirmity." These few words are a key to open the mind of the bishop, and you can see clearly as in a glass the whole drift of his religious opinions. If we follow these words to their logical conclusion we are bound to believe that Bishop Thirlwall was a Unitarian, and would justify infidelity and atheism. When a man is born blind, or with one arm, it is self-evident that the blind man and the one-armed are not responsible for their condition. They were not the authors of their own beings or their own bodies. Others were responsible for their existence, and their existence in the condition we have supposed them to have been born; there is, therefore, no sort of responsibility whatever resting upon them, for they did not create themselves. But when men are brought to existence by others, and brought up to an age of responsibility they understand that they are moral beings. They know the difference between good and evil; they have power to think, and talk, and act. This power they can

use according to their own choice, so that men's thoughts, words, and actions are their own property, and are thoroughly accountable for them. They do not belong to anybody else for they are their own creations. Bishop Thirlwall institutes a comparison between what is brought to existence by another, namely, physical infirmity, and what is brought into existence by one's self, namely, his thoughts, words, and actions. Bishop Thirlwall is guilty of reasoning fallaciously, for he compares things that differ. According to his reasoning, Simon Magus, the magician, thought he could purchase the gifts of the Holy Ghost with money. Since man, according to Bishop Thirlwall, is not responsible for his thoughts and opinions, Simon, the magician, was an innocent man; and it was not right of St. Peter, the Apostle, to denounce him in the way he did by saying that he was in the "gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity." If Bishop Thirlwall reasoned correctly St. Paul was not justified in bringing a curse upon Elymas, the sorcerer, by telling him, "O full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt not thou cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord? And now, behold, the hand of the Lord is upon thee, and thou shalt be blind, not seeing the sun for a season." And immediately there fell on him a mist and a darkness, and he went about seeking some to lead him by the hand. The sorcerer did not believe the things that were preached by St. Paul, and according to the reasoning of Bishop Thirlwall, the Apostle did not act justly to use the power given to him to call the vengeance of heaven upon his head, for he was not responsible for his opinions. When the Apostle St. John visited the public baths at Ephesus he noticed Cerinthus there, and when the Apostle saw him he ran out at once declaring that he could not remain for fear the roof of the building would fall on his head. He

attributed his fears to the fact that a heretic was there and that vengeance might at any time overtake him. But according to the reasoning of Bishop Thirlwall St. John showed much weak-mindedness, for had not Cerinthus every right to deny the divinity of Jesus Christ since men are not accountable for their beliefs? The Emperor Julian, the apostate, when he declared his preference for the pagan religion to the christian was quite within his rights, for he was not responsible for the conclusion he arrived at in showing such a preference. All the doctrines of the Gospel, wherever preached, carry with them a tremendous responsibility, for those who reject and disbelieve them are open to everlasting punishment. This, without a doubt, is the plain teaching of the Bible. The statement of Bishop Thirlwall would make the heresiarchs of the world throughout the ages, from the foundation of the Christian Church to the present time, notwithstanding their damnable heresies, innocent and respectable men. The infidels of the present day deny altogether human responsibility, and declare that the thoughts, words, and actions of men are the innocent results of bodily and mental organisation. These men loudly proclaim that there cannot possibly be any transgression, and that all that takes place in creation are like the ebb and flow of the tides, caused by the laws of nature. These beliefs would naturally lead to the denial of God and all manner of responsibility, and reduce the universe to a nonsensical entity. Whether Bishop Connop Thirlwall did believe anything like this we cannot say, but in charity we would prefer to believe that his statement commented upon was delivered in an unguarded moment, and that he in the depth of his heart did truly believe in the blessed Gospel of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.

IV.—BISHOP CONNOP THIRLWALL'S DISTRIBUTION

OF PATRONAGE. Bishop Thirlwall, according to the description already given of him, was a man of great pride, and this sin would naturally separate him from all other men. He was also a very silent man, he would not talk himself nor would he encourage others to talk in his presence. These two characteristics would to a great extent make him a stranger to his own diocese, to his clergy, and to laymen. This being the case, he was obliged to depend upon the recommendations of others when appointing clergymen to benefices. These favoured persons whom he consulted would generally recommend their relatives and friends. These persons who recommended considered themselves perfectly free from any kind of responsibility, and considered that the bishop was the real patron and that the whole responsibility rested upon his shoulders. The bishop on the other hand, because he had consulted trustworthy clergymen, as he thought, considered himself not at all accountable, and between both parties shirking in this way all responsibility, some of the appointments were really scandalous, for most unsuitable men were frequently sent to parishes who did not perform their duties faithfully therein. The bishop could not release himself from responsibility, or improve in any way the appointments, but he was exceedingly wrathful with the persons who recommended to him unsuitable appointments. We were told that after a while, after giving it a fair trial, that the bishop was disgusted with the infeasibility of this plan of appointing clergymen to benefices, and he thought of another. Some clergymen were inclined to believe that the bishop really adopted this second plan. We cannot vouch for the truth of it, and can only say that some believe that he did, and if this opinion is correct we can only add that we would believe it possible of him more than of any other man we have ever known, for he detested work of this kind with

all his heart and did not wish to be troubled with clerical appointments of any sort. This second plan that the bishop adopted, according to the belief of some, was that of lottery, or as it is sometimes called the wheel of fortune. When a vacancy occurred in any part of the diocese in his patronage, he would receive many applications, and would write the names of the applicants on separate slips of paper, and would place them around under the wheel. On the wheel there was a certain mark, after putting everything in order he would give a turn to the wheel and wait till it stopped and then would look for his mark and then noticing the name under the mark, for that name would indicate the destined candidate for the appointment. Whether it is possible for credulity to go so far as to believe that this plan of distributing patronage did actually take place is what we cannot imagine, and only state that this was a general report and believed by the credulous throughout the diocese. However, we quite believe that if this plan was resorted to the appointments themselves were quite as good as the appointments made by the recommendation of friends, for it was almost impossible in the days of Bishop Thirlwall for appointments to benefices to have reached a lower ebb. The following cases among many other came under our direct observation. We quite grant that these cases are hardly believable, but we declare them to be perfectly true, for the clergymen and the circumstances were well-known to us. There was a charge of drunkenness brought against a curate in charge of a parish, who, on a certain Sunday afternoon, went to do duties in a neighbouring parish. When he returned to do the evening duties in his own parish he was so much under the influence of drink as to be quite unfit to perform the services, but he persisted in doing so. After going through the confession he was unable to get up from his knees, and the clerk went to

him and took him out in his arms in the sight of the whole congregation, he was staggering as he went and seemed quite incapable to walk even with the assistance of the clerk. A committee of the chief members of the church met on the following evening to consider the case and to determine what to do under the circumstances. The curate himself appeared among them crying pitifully and weeping bitter tears and begging for forgiveness, but one of the members who had more courage than the rest spoke to him and said it was shameful and cowardly on his part to come among them in that way when he had brought such a scandal upon the church the evening before. The poor curate's distress however melted their hearts, and they resolved not to write to the bishop on one condition, that he should vacate that curacy at once and seek another far enough away. In a day or two, in that very week, a benefice became vacant, and the curate applied for it and succeeded with the bishop in getting the appointment. This drunken curate before that week came to an end was the vicar of a large and populous parish. This case is one of the most sad we have ever known, and reflects most disgracefully upon the present system of patronage, and upon the patron who gave the appointment. The bishop was most precipitate in making the appointment. He could not blame any other persons on this occasion, for he had no time to make inquiries about the character of this curate, nor ask anyone's opinion about him.

We remember another case somewhat similar to the above. An important living became vacant, and the bishop asked a friend to recommend him a suitable clergyman. This friend, as was generally the case, recommended a relative, and he was

appointed. Almost immediately afterwards it was found out that there was something wrong about the morals of this clergyman, but before the bishop could hear anything about it his induction was hastened that he might be safe of the benefice; but if we remember well he was suspended for three years before he went into residence. But on this occasion the bishop had a scapegoat to take away from his own shoulders, as he considered it, the whole responsibility of the appointment, namely, the friend who had recommended this clergyman. He made this poor friend to suffer; he poured out all the vials of his wrath upon his head, and though he came in frequent contact with him he never forgave him, and never spoke to him again as long as he lived.

It will suffice to show the ridiculous appointments of Bishop Thirlwall if we mention one other case. A vacancy occurred in a large country parish, and the bishop appointed a clergyman to this parish who lived only a few miles from Abergwili Palace. If the bishop took notice of what occurred in the neighbourhood he should have known the character of this clergyman thoroughly, for he was a notorious tipler. After a few years the bishop sent a messenger to this clergyman and offered him a sum of money if he resigned his benefice. The bargain was struck, and the vicar resigned, and we trust that the soul of the bishop had more rest and quietness after this transaction.

V.—BISHOP CONNOP THIRLWALL'S TEMPER. We have pointed out already that Bishop Thirlwall was fond of quietness, loved retirement, gloried in absolute loneliness; and having at all times this strong

desire for solitude we might naturally conclude that it would be difficult and almost impossible to discover whether he had any temper, but his profession could not allow him absolute seclusion. He would sometimes ask visitors to stay a few days at the palace, but they did not see much of their host; he would remain in his room by himself, and the visitors were left to enjoy themselves as best they could. More frequently than otherwise he did not join them even at meals. Clergymen called to see him, some on business, but if the business was not very important he felt greatly annoyed at being disturbed with people calling without some palpable reason. A clergyman once called to see him, and having told him his message, the bishop made the cool remark, "I think, Mr. Jones, you are a very unwise man in wasting your time and wasting money to come such a distance to see me here, for you could have stated what you have now told me quite as well in a letter, which would not have cost you more than a penny stamp." Another clergyman called upon him who found fault with him for appointing an unsuitable man to a benefice. The bishop was not prepared to be spoken to in the manner this clergyman did, and he caught him by the shoulders, and gave him a tremendous shaking. The poor man was so frightened that he burst into tears and wept like a child for a long time. The bishop seeing his distress took pity upon him, and offered him a glass of wine, and they presently parted the best of friends. On another occasion another clergyman called at the palace. He was stout, and tall, and strong, and in considerable temper when he entered, for the bishop had refused to appoint him to a benefice upon which he had set

his heart. The two men when they came face to face at once commenced to talk in a most angry tone. The talk of one was full of complaints, of cruelty, of injustice, and of insult; and the talk of the other was full of honesty of purpose, of vindication, and of justification. From acrimonious talk, they proceeded, so the story goes, to laying hold of each other and actually eventuated in blows. Both were strong men, but it never leaked out which of them had the best of the fight. There is enough evidence to prove that during the whole course of his episcopate, when dealing with both clergy and laity, Bishop Thirlwall exhibited an ungovernable temper.

It appears that during one part of his life he was engaged to be married. We believe that he and his lady-love did not see much of each other, but they most faithfully corresponded, but it was reported that the correspondence was not always running very smoothly. It was said that when they saw each other they did not manifest a very warm affection, but frequently quarrelled. It seems that she was also bad tempered, and by degrees they discovered that there was no true affection existing between them. When they saw each other for the last time they came to the wise conclusion that since both of them had a passionate disposition, and an incompatibility of temper, they should go through life separately, and in single blessedness.

VI.—BISHOP CONNOP THIRLWALL'S MOST DELIGHTFUL OCCUPATION. All men, without distinction of rank, not only have certain peculiarities, idiosyncracies, and eccentricities, some more, some less, but they have also one great distinct leading characteristic,

naturally or acquired. The four different temperaments, some of which exist in all men, cannot be the cause of these leading characteristics in different individuals. Whether we believe in phrenology or not the general observations of men compel the belief that there are natural characteristics which make men differ originally from each other. Whether bodily or mental organization cause this difference we are not at present prepared to decide. When a man begins to proceed on the journey of life, and as his powers of observation develop as he comes in daily contact with different men and women he will soon find out that there are original and distinct differences in their capacities and dispositions. One man is naturally selfish, cruel, and unkind. Another is naturally humble, meek, and condescending. We have no doubt, however, that learning and education, and especially religious training, will have the effect of changing even natural inclinations and characteristics. With regard to Bishop Connop Thirlwall he was naturally high-minded, and, evidently, his upbringing and education did not correct or change his nature, but rather developed his natural propensities and inclinations. Had he persevered to qualify himself for the Bar, as was his original intention, and that it was necessary for him to earn his living by his profession, Bishop Thirlwall would be probably quite a different man. Instead of being slow, sluggish, and indolent, he would have been prompt, quick, and full of activity. Since he chose to enter the Ministry of the Church he could indulge his natural inclinations to perfection, and live almost continually in ease and isolation. When he was professor at Cambridge he was master over his pupils, and could indulge his feelings of pride and

high-mindedness to any extent he desired. When, afterwards, he became rector of a small country parish, in his utter loneliness he became a historian. We would not be at all surprised that while he was rector of Kirkby Underdale he spent most of his time with his books, and in writing his History. It would be quite in keeping with his character if he detested the work of visiting his parishioners on week days, and of preaching to them on Sundays. When he was appointed Bishop of St. David's he was a confirmed misanthrope, and living by himself at Abergwili Palace, the master of all he surveyed, he had no wish to see a living soul. He loathed and hated to have any visitors in his house. He wanted to be alone, thoroughly alone in his study with his books. We could well believe it that the duties he was expected to perform in the diocese, such as confirmations, consecration of churches, the opening of churches after restoration, and the delivering of triennial charges, were a heavy burden upon his soul; but necessity at times compelled him when holding confirmation services in distant parts of his diocese, such as Pembrokeshire and Cardiganshire, to spend a few nights from home. When he did so, and was obliged to be away from his books, he gave himself up to a little enjoyment, but on these occasions he still remained by himself, and without a single companion with him. His chief pleasure at these times was in the "weed," but he was different to other men in his enjoyments as he was different in all other things to ordinary mortals.

The following account was told us by an arch-deacon who had the information from the best possible authority: When he was spending a night at an hotel at Aberayron, he was in a room by

himself. On the table before him he had a vessel resembling a teapot. In this vessel there was about two pounds of tobacco, and in this tobacco he managed to put two large long pipes. After lighting the tobacco he put the two pipes in his mouth, one at each corner, and then he pulled with all his might and main until the large room was filled with so dense a smoke that not a single object within the place was visible. Whether this kind of smoking was indulged in on this occasion only or on other occasions also in order to kill time, because he was absent from his books, or whether it was a frequent occurrence at his home, we are not able to testify. We would, however, be favourable to the opinion that he would be wasting away precious time, and would be kept from his books for too long a period if he smoked in this manner too frequently. Bishop Thirlwall was a man who knew the value of time, and he was most careful to save it as much as he possibly could that he may devote it to reading and consulting his books. The bishop had three different ways to economise time. His first plan of saving his minutes was to eat his meals only once in twenty-four hours, but it was said that when he took his food then he consumed as much as five men could eat. The second plan to save time was by not keeping a watch! A gentleman once asked him why he did not keep a watch. His answer was that he did not require one, "For a watch," he said, "requires a great deal of attention; a man spends much time in winding it, and in consulting it, and in taking care of it; I save all this time through not having a watch, and I do not find any inconvenience thereby. I give all my orders to my butler, and I make him respon-

sible for the punctuality of all my engagements." The third plan of the bishop to save time was by allowing his nails to grow to a remarkably great length, generally about an inch long. We have never seen nails so long in our life with any other man or woman. We can well suppose that the bishop went on with his reading while his butler attended to cleaning his nails morning and evening. By letting them grow long he could not spend time in cutting, and trimming and cleaning them. By this plan he could save much every day, which additional time he could devote to his books. The most delightful occupation of his life was in reading. He grudged every moment that he was taken away from his books. He looked the picture of misery, and wore a scowling face constantly when anyone disturbed him and called him away from his study. We could reasonably think that the performance of his episcopal duties, when he was obliged to be away from home, would be a trouble to him grievous to be borne. He was seldom seen without a book in his hand; at home he lived in his study and among his books; when walking about his grounds and feeding his swans he had one book under one arm and another book under his other arm and another held before him. When driving in his carriage, when travelling on the railways, when waiting at railway stations, when going from place to place, at home, or in London, or any other town, you would never see him without his books, and always engaged with his delightful occupation. Night and day through a long life he had been drinking continually at the fountain of knowledge. From a man of Bishop Thirlwall's talent and learning and erudition we would expect after his death volumes of

magnificent writings that would really astonish the great scholars of the earth.

But, Hear, O ye heavens—give ear, O ye earth—the great scholar of England, into whose mind the great learning of the past ages did run without intermission,—the mighty Bishop Thirlwall of St. David's, left behind him as the result of his great erudition thirteen ordinary Welsh sermons, and a few common-place charges, delivered at visitations!

Bishop Thirlwall is like the Dead Sea—all the water of the Jordan comes down a mighty river into the Dead Sea, and there it disappears, for there is no outlet for its waters to go farther, and they vanish invisibly by evaporation. In a similar manner the great knowledge and learning of Bishop Thirlwall, which came rushing into his mind, but had no outlet, and must have escaped through some remarkably, mysterious evaporation. We at present leave this remarkable man with, we trust, no enmity in our heart towards him. We are certainly conscious of having received much unkindness at his hands, but we freely forgive him as we hope to be forgiven. We are certainly of the opinion that he ought never to be appointed bishop; he had no suitability whatever for the office; he was what we may denominate a political bishop, and appointed by the Prime Minister of the day to strengthen the powers of the liberal party in the House of Lords. He was the only bishop that voted for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church, but we trust he had time to repent of that great robbery of sacred property. When our own life in this world shall come to an end, and we cross the river and go to the world beyond, we will probably

meet Bishop Connop Thirlwall in the world of spirits. We quite believe we shall see him with all his pride gone, with all his conceit evaporated; with all his high-mindedness vanished; and that he has undergone a thorough and radical change, that he is now and will be for ever more the most humble of the saints in paradise.



NOTES

ON

WILLIAM BASIL JONES, LORD BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S.

Bishop W. Basil Jones before he was appointed Bishop of St. David's was Archdeacon of York. He was a native of the principality, and was born in North Cardiganshire.

Sometime before his appointment Welshmen generally had become very warm patriots: they wanted everything that was Welsh; even the denominations joined with churchmen in the cry for Welsh bishops. The Bishop of St. Asaph died, and a loud cry went up from the principality for Welsh-speaking bishops. Mr. W. E. Gladstone, who was Prime Minister at the time, heard the cry, and responded favourably by appointing Joshua Hughes, who was at the time Vicar of Llandovery, to the vacant bishopric, who, we believe, was the first Welsh bishop for many generations.

The next vacancy occurred at St. David's, and, principally, because Archdeacon Jones of York was a native of Wales he was appointed Bishop of St. David's. No doubt Bishop Jones had several good qualities to recommend him; he was a decent scholar and had taken a distinguished position at his

University; he was a native of the principality; he had winning manners and a kind disposition. Had Bishop Jones remained Archdeacon of York, probably he would have been a most excellent archdeacon, and a most popular clergyman. But when he was elevated to be Bishop of St. David's he, like almost all the other bishops, allowed his feeling to get the mastery over his reason. He took a long survey of his estate, and saw that he was overseer of a diocese that had within it between four hundred to five hundred clergymen and many curates; that he had power over most of the benefices, and had many appointments to posts of honour. The consciousness of having so much power completely spoiled him. At interviews he still had the same kindly smile, he continued the same mildness of manner, and he retained his usual amiable conversation; but in his correspondence he was sharp, severe and bitter; his pen was made of iron, and his ink mixed with vinegar. We have been informed that during the latter years of his episcopate he had disputes, quarrels, and angry correspondence with almost every clergyman in his diocese. It is difficult to account for this state of things, for on some occasions where others would take offence he was remarkably good-natured. Though he was born in the county of Cardigan, one of the most Welshy counties in the principality, yet he had only a smattering knowledge of the Welsh language, and sometimes he made most ridiculous mistakes. We remember that on one occasion he was holding a Confirmation in the Parish Church of Ystradgynlais—the rural dean acted as chaplain. After the service was over, and while taking off his robes in the vestry, the chaplain told him of the many mistakes he had committed while

reading some parts of the service and in delivering his charges to the confirmees. He took the corrections from the rural dean with the utmost good humour, and in a spirit of thankfulness. However, it struck the writer who was present as a most marvellous occurrence that a man could have been appointed bishop of a large Welsh diocese, and who made use of that language generally at confirmations in country parishes, and that this very bishop should have been told by an incumbent in his diocese that he had committed twenty mistakes at one service. We are not blind to many good points in Bishop Jones; however, candour compels us to testify that he had been guilty of making many and sad mistakes in his distribution of patronage. We have already shewn the difficulty and even the impossibility of any individual patron to exercise the duties of patronage without giving offence to the non-successful applicants, and probably making them bitter enemies. We are conscientiously bound to declare our opinion that Bishop Basil Jones made some most foolish appointments, and we have often wondered how the church has prospered as well as she has while suffering so much under the calamities of patronage. Some of the appointments of Bishop Jones were quite as bad as the appointments of Bishop Connop Thirlwall, when, as some people believed, his appointments were made by the aid of the wheel of fortune. We shall at present only mention one more appointment of Bishop Basil Jones. It was without a doubt a very wrong appointment, and yet it was almost impossible for him to have done otherwise. We blame the system of patronage more than the bishop. An office of dignity became vacant, and a great political magnate

who lived in the very neighbourhood where Bishop Jones himself was brought up—the two families were doubtless on visiting terms—and this gentleman, for political reasons, was greatly interested in the above appointment, and he desired that this appointment should be given to a clergyman, a relative of a family which at different times had given a great and constant help at parliamentary elections to the gentleman in question. So great was his desire to assist his protégé that he condescended to go and see the bishop on his behalf, and ask him to appoint his friend. Under the circumstances refusal was out of the question, and in a few days the announcement was made in the newspapers that this clergyman, quite an ordinary man, and comparatively young, an incumbent of a small country parish, was appointed to the vacant post. Had there been a Board of Patronage in existence this appointment, and almost all other appointments by individual patrons, would have been an impossibility. It is this power in the hands of single individuals, as we have insisted all along, to make appointments for the Church, that has been the ruination of the Church in many parishes. What we would desire to see in the Church is a speedy reform, a quick alteration, an immediate change in the system of making appointments. There is too much of the taste of earth in the present plan of distributing patronage. The power which appoints bishops to their sacred offices is a worldly power, and this power is afterwards continued by the bishops themselves when they distribute the loaves and fishes of the Church. We would like to see an upward movement taking place in the Church, a lifting of her a long way above the ground of worldliness

and corruption, and taken up considerably nearer to heaven, into a brighter, a serener, and a purer atmosphere, that when the perennial springs of the waters of life should be poured in showers of blessings upon her head she would be in a condition to enjoy the valuable gifts of the Spirit. The Church is at present like a ship taken up by the tide too far into the land. The Church is on a dry ground, where no water is; she is full of divisions, of jealousies, of hatreds, of strife, and of all kinds of ungodly works. If the choicest blessings of heaven were poured down upon the Church in her present worldly condition they would be thoroughly wasted, as the winds on the desert air. Before heavenly blessings can be enjoyed the hearts of men must be prepared for their reception, like a ground prepared for seed.

O God, bless abundantly Thy Holy Church; give her bishops more spirituality of mind; give her clergy more energy to preach Thy blessed gospel to the world; and pour upon her members and upon the world the spirit of grace and supplication.



NOTES

ON

JOHN OWEN, LORD BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S.

We had fully prepared the Notes on Bishop John Owen for publication, and we would have been very glad for many reasons to do so, for his administration of the diocese and his distribution of patronage has been far from giving general satisfaction. He has frequently promoted younger before older clergymen. He has allowed clergymen of long standing to remain in parishes where good administration would have dictated their removal years ago to lighter spheres. However, at the advice of a friend in whom we have great confidence, we do not print the Notes on Bishop John Owen in the present edition. The two bishops on whom we have written Notes are dead and can therefore have no opportunity of mending their ways. Bishop John Owen is alive and comparatively young, and it is to be hoped that his administration of the diocese will improve with the advancement of years. Though we do not print the prepared Notes, we wish nevertheless to make a few general remarks, some of them in his favour, others otherwise. We are glad to state that he is not proud, as was Bishop Thirlwall, and he is not conceited as was Bishop Jones, but there may exist the danger that he also

may become more so. We confess that we are not pleased with his desire to gain more power over the clergy. He has lately exchanged the patronage of benefices with patrons of benefices in St. David's for patronage of benefices he had in other dioceses, with the evident intention of increasing his patronage in St David's, and in order no doubt of increasing his power over the clergy of his own diocese. According to our idea he has infinitely too much power already, and we would gladly see every atom of power over the clergy taken away from all bishops. This would bring bishops and clergy nearer together. The separation between them at present is far too distant. The bishops are at present the masters, and the clergy the slaves. We are perfectly sure that the clergy are actuated in all their dealings with the bishops more by the feelings of fear than by the feelings of love, to the great detriment of genuine religion. We wish to make only one other remark in connection with Bishop John Owen. The population of all the dioceses consists of two classes, the clergy and the laity, and bishops come in contact continually with both. It has been noticed and pretty generally observed that Bishop John Owen treats the clergy and the laity in a totally different spirit. Bishop Connop Thirlwall treated all men alike; he kept all at a distance. Bishop Basil Jones treated the nobility and the aristocracy on a state of perfect equality. Bishop John Owen, owing to the power derived from patronage, treats the clergy with neglect and indifference, but he treats the laity with almost a cringing condescension. The reasons for this difference are explained in our Notes, which are not to be published at present. Bishop John Owen has pursued a policy towards

the aristocracy of the diocese which is most creditable to his wisdom. Had he treated them on equal terms, or with a spirit of independence, he would have alienated them to a man, but because he, remembering the rock from which he was hewn, was willing to go down to the dust of humiliation, the aristocracy of the diocese at first took pity upon him, then respected him, and now look upon him with feelings of affection and love. We are glad to testify that Bishop John Owen at the present time stands high in the estimation of the laity of the diocese of St. David's, and in order to show their appreciation of him they have presented him with a motor car that he may visit with greater ease the distant parts of the diocese.



CONCLUSION.

Instead of the Notes we intended publishing on the present Bishop of St. David's we will conclude our remarks with general observations bearing indirectly on Church Reform.

The system which we wish principally to reform is the system of patronage. We consider this system, from the appointments of bishops down to the appointments of curates, as one of the most injurious to the success of the Church. It is wrong in principle that the civil power should appoint our bishops. It greatly depends upon the character of the Prime Minister whether he would wish to nominate a bishop who would be a credit to the Church and to his Christian profession or otherwise. Neither can we judge from one appointment the character of the appointments which might follow. We readily grant that the last nomination made by the present Prime Minister could not be improved upon, and is a credit to both his head and his heart, but should he have the chance of appointing another that appointment might turn out a complete failure. We have had bishops both in England and Wales who proved by their actions that they were most inferior both in intellect and in tact. There have been appointed from time to time bishops in the Welsh Church who were most unfit to perform the duties thereof. We do not allude altogether to the times when Englishmen were appointed to Welsh dioceses, who were not able to do the work on

account of their ignorance of the Welsh language. Independently of this inability on account of the language we have had bishops of inferior intellect who did irreparable damage to the Church. Had there been a Board of Patronage in each diocese, and the Church governed by Convocation, the Church would not have been in a minority, as she is to-day. If the interviews which have frequently taken place between bishops and candidates for Holy Orders were printed for the last half century we could well believe that it would have been the most popular book in the world. Probably the most wonderful successful hint for promotion to a bishopric that is to be found in recent history was that of the Rev. George Mountain. The reverend gentleman was a friend of King George the Third, and chanced to be in the company of the king when His Majesty mentioned to Mr. Mountain that a certain colonial bishop had died suddenly a few days before, and "I cannot," said the king, "think of a suitable successor." The Reverend Mr. Mountain, quite spontaneously, and without any hesitation, at once answered the king and said, "If your Majesty had faith as much as a grain of mustard seed you would say to this Mountain," pointing to himself, "be thou cast unto the sea (see), and it would be done." Mr. Mountain's ready wit was so successful that he had the promise of the bishopric there and then from His Majesty.

Remarkable things have frequently taken place between English and Welsh bishops and candidates for Holy Orders. We remember a friend of ours on one occasion being asked by a Welsh bishop to pay him a visit with the object of having an interview before giving the candidate permission to look

out for a curacy and to have a title for ordination. On a certain day agreed upon this friend travelled some distance and appeared in due time at the bishop's palace. The bishop gave him a good welcome and a kind reception, and conversed with him at first about things in general—about the weather, about the distance he had travelled, and unimportant things about the journey. After a while the bishop commenced to talk to the candidate about the object of his visit, and said, "I have asked you, Mr. Jones, to come and see me that I might satisfy myself that you are in all respects qualified to be a minister of the gospel. It is my custom to ask the different candidates that come to see me to ask them questions generally and principally from the Bible. I am very particular that every minister of the gospel in my diocese should have a thorough knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, for how can a man teach the doctrines of the Bible unless he knows the Bible himself? I consider it a matter of great importance that all ministers of the gospel should have a correct knowledge of the Bible. When I was at the Grammar Schools, and at the University, I never neglected the Holy Scriptures, and I flatter myself that I have a pretty good knowledge of the Old and the New Testaments. I shall ask you, at first, Mr. Jones, some simple and easy questions, and as we get on I will probably ask you some harder ones. Will you please tell me, Mr. Jones, how many children had Abraham?" Our friend answered readily, "Eight, my lord." The bishop stood for a while in mute astonishment, and afterwards said, "I have no doubt, Mr. Jones, that you have misunderstood my question. I will ask you again, Mr. Jones, how many children had

Abraham?" Our friend answered again, in the same way as before, "Eight, my lord." The bishop remained quietly for a longer time on this occasion, and spoke at last, as if speaking to himself, "Well, well; this is really remarkable," and then again spoke to Mr. Jones, and said, but this time with considerable irritation and temper, "Now, sir, I will ask you the third time, how many children had Abraham?" Mr. Jones answered with a calm, but this time with rather a serious face, and said, as heretofore, "Eight, my lord." The bishop this time was quite beyond himself with rage and anger, and spoke, at present, with almost insulting tones, "I have had some ignorant men here before, but I have never seen anything like this; you are the most ignorant man, sir, that I have ever seen, and I have almost a wish to turn you out of the house as a perfect ignoramus. However, before you go, and since you so persist in your ignorance, I will give you a chance to explain yourself, for I consider it a most singular incident that a man like you should come here to visit me with the object of becoming a preacher and teacher of the Gospel and you do not know how many children had Abraham. Explain yourself, sir, and let me know the reason of your great ignorance of the Bible." Our friend, still calm, but a little nervous, said, "I thank you, my lord, for giving me an opportunity to explain myself. Abraham had a son, called Ishmael, from Hagar; he had another son, Isaac, from Sarah; and from his second wife, Keturah, he had six sons, called Zimran, and Jokshan, and Medan, and Midian, and——" The bishop cried out, with a loud voice, and in tremendous agitation, "Stop, stop, stop! I do not know those myself."

It was the bishop's turn to be in disgrace this time. There never was such a great collapse. From the pinnacle of episcopal greatness, and wrath, and displeasure, the bishop descended with the speed of the lightning to the greatest condition of humility. He begged Mr. Jones' pardon several dozen times over. The poor candidate had completely conquered the proud bishop, and the conquest had such an effect upon him after his rudeness and cruelty to Mr. Jones that his feelings had completely mastered him; he was willing to give Mr. Jones almost everything: he asked him to stay with him for a week as his guest; he wished to pay his travelling expenses; he proffered the loan of money if he were in need of any; he promised him the best curacy in the diocese and great future advancement.

We have no chance of knowing what ridiculous questions are frequently asked by bishops in their examinations.

The bishop mentioned above, on another occasion, when examining a candidate went on quite near him, and touched his forehead, and said to him while doing so, "I think you are rather empty here," but this candidate was not going to be bamboozled by any bishop, and told him so, and the bishop in order to make friends again with the candidate, actually passed him, and showed him after that particular kindness. As long as bishops will be appointed by the civil government so long will there be inferior bishops in the Church of England.

There is no doubt but that great damage is done to the Church by bishops' statements and promises. There is a great difference between different bishops in this respect. We have described

Bishop Connop Thirlwall as mute and silent and taciturn. We described Bishop Basil Jones as also comparatively silent. He was very careful about his statements, and appeared as if he measured his words by a rule. There should be no danger in their promises and statements. The present bishop in this respect is totally different. He is a great talker, makes many statements, and his promises are almost numberless. The result of this is that in a multiplication of promises he cannot remember them. We remember his talking to us on one occasion about the ordination of literates. "I am," he said, "going to make that particular curate the only exception," and the bishop repeated the words "only exception" at least a dozen times in a few minutes. Probably, after a short time, he forgot everything he had said, for in six months he ordained another literate, and to our certain knowledge he was willing to ordain another. Men who are fond of talking for the sake of talking cannot remember half they say, and in the case of bishops it is most unfortunate, for they may make promises and afterwards forget them. Those to whom they were made will remember them and expect their fulfilment, and the results will be disappointments, disagreements, fault findings, and ultimately a great damage will be done to the Church. We are quite confirmed in the opinion that as long as bishops continue to have such power over the destinies of the Church, clergymen will be disgusted more and more with their partiality, and the very foolish appointments they often make. We have frequently noticed, when a parish with a very large church becomes vacant, a clergyman with a small voice, who cannot be heard throughout one quarter of the

church, will most probably be appointed. On the other hand, in small churches clergymen of stentorian voices will be appointed to them.

When a clergyman has been advised by his medical adviser to go away from a lowland or sea-side parish to a parish standing on a higher ground, for the sake of his health, and even for the sake of his life, can we expect bishops to take cognizance of cases such as these, and act the Samaritan? We must confess we have not seen them yet. The probability is that they have bespoken the parish suitable to the invalid to some friend or other previously. We well remember a large parish with five thousand population, and with a large congregation. The clergyman was an excellent man, a very popular preacher who attracted great congregations wherever he preached. This clergyman was stricken down with illness, and never recovered his usual strength, but lived for many years, and officiated almost to the last in his church. But with this result, that he was not able to be heard now in his large church, consequently the congregation diminished, and latterly not more than a dozen people attended. The church was practically destroyed in the parish; if the bishop had had the common sense of other men he would have removed this clergyman to a smaller parish where he could have done the duties there admirably for years, and appoint a younger and a stronger clergyman to this large parish. Frequently such cases prevail in the present day. The present system of patronage is much too antiquated and unsuitable to men's feelings in these democratic times. The clergy as a class are not likely to tolerate much longer the great injustice that is done in

these appointments, and are eagerly expecting the day of their freedom from the present corrupt system of patronage. The bishops through having this power in their hands frequently inflict much cruelty upon the clergy through their most unwise appointments. What could be a greater punishment to a highly educated clergyman, of an independent spirit and of gentlemanly instincts, than to be kept for years in an inferior position because he cannot act the parasite, and see another of inferior qualifications thrust unjustly before him? There are many clergymen who are truly sorry that they ever entered the ministry of the Church on account of these abuses committed by bishops through their partial appointments. Bishop Connop Thirlwall made most lamentable mistakes in his distribution of patronage, whether by means of his wheel of destiny, or otherwise. Bishops Basil Jones and John Owen have also made sad appointments, and, in our opinion, not any better than by Thirlwall's wheel of fortune. If this corrupt system is to continue much longer, which we sincerely hope it will not, for the sake of the Church and for the sake of religion, it will require the greatest care on the part of patrons to avoid a revolution, for the times are undergoing such a rapid change, and abuses that were patiently endured in the past will not be endured in the future.

This cruel system has already done a great injury to the Church in that it has prevented many young gentlemen of talent, and suitable in all respects for the ministry, from seeking ordination. They could not tolerate a system where the flatterers are the favourites for promotion, and where the

more intelligent and respectable are kept, sometimes for a lifetime, in positions of inferiority. We have no doubt about the question that the present system of patronage is what brings the greatest scandal upon the Church in our days. Its deadly poison seems to find its way into every department of the Church, and spoils everything. This system spoils the bishops by making them disgustingly consequential; it spoils the clergy by tempting them to become parasites and flatterers; it spoils the Church by sending unsuitable men to the different parishes; it spoils religion by creating jealousies and animosities and hatreds between different incumbents; it spoils good feeling and brotherly love among the curates by promoting younger before the older men in the ministry; it spoils many of the laity by preventing suitable men to seek Holy Orders; it spoils the progress of morality and religion among the clergy by creating conditions in which many of them are obliged to live in a state of semi-destitution. We earnestly desire that this great power that is now given to patrons, and by the exercise of which the Church is so greatly injured, should be taken away. But against this much-needed reform there will arise a mighty opposition by interested parties. This opposition will be shown chiefly by bishops; they will not surrender their power if by any possibility they can keep it. Is it not by this power they can rule over the clergy, they can tyrannise over incumbents, they can show unkindness to the curates? Is it not by this power that bishops differ so much in their conduct towards the laity and in their conduct towards the clergy? Is it not exceedingly transparent that bishops will cringe and bow and smile, and make themselves

most agreeable to the aristocracy and the squirearchy? But the same bishops will be independent, surly, rude, and domineering in their treatment of the clergy, and why should they not be so? Are they not the masters of the poor clergy, and can do with them just as they like? Without a doubt the chief opponents of Church Reform will be the bishops; they will not only not relinquish their power, but by every possible means they will increase it. Exchanges of patronage is being done at present, frequently, with the sole object of increasing their power. The bishops of the principality are now Welshmen, and pretend to be very emphatic Welshmen withal. Their chances of being selected for Welsh bishoprics depends to a great extent upon the intensity of their Welsh feeling, but through some strange and unaccountable inconsistency the higher offices of the Church, as deaneries and canonries, which were held by Welshmen five years ago, are held by Englishmen to-day, and these appointments are evidently made by these intense Welsh bishops. Can inconsistency further go? If the present iniquitous system of patronage is going to continue much longer, when there exists so much partiality in the appointments, when there is so much cruelty shown to many of the clergy, when some of the best men are so sadly neglected in the Church, then we make a free and open confession that we would gladly hail the day when not even we would welcome a drastic reform, but even an actual revolution in the relationship between the State and the Church.

We do not want Disestablishment, or a severance of the connection between them: that, in our

view is simply an impossibility. We want the Church and the State each to be put on a proper basis, and their relationship friendly and reasonable. We would dread a hundred times, more for the sake of England itself, the robbery of her sacred property; to alienate this sacred property would bring upon our kingdom such a measure of wrath from heaven that would result not only in our degradation but in utter ruin.

May God in His mercy prevent the perpetration of such wickedness by the rulers of England, and spare our country the resulting calamity. All we want is Reform, for to leave our beloved Church in her present corrupt condition (we allude to her administration) would only bring about gradually, but inevitably, her complete demoralisation.

Our principal object in writing these Notes is to throw as much contumely as we possibly can upon her present system of making appointments. The Church is in so much danger through this cruel monster of patronage; her great work in the world is greatly hindered by her degraded administration; her fair beauty cannot shine forth in its glory as long as her earthly caterers distribute so unequally her loaves and fishes. We look forward most hopefully for her freedom from earthly entanglements. The great Master, we trust, will soon come to visit His temple, when He will purify her holy precincts, when He will cast out the sellers and the buyers from her courts, when He will overthrow the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of them who sell doves, and will say unto them, "It is written, My house shall be called the house of

prayer; but ye have made it a den of thieves." We look forward confidently to the time when all appointments to her different offices will be just and pure and true. We eagerly expect the hour when the civil government will cease from troubling, and will honestly defend and not rule within the holy places of her sanctuaries. We will put our trust in the arm of the Almighty, and not in any arm of flesh. We will put our confidence in the throne of Heaven, and not in the throne of England. We will wait for the Lord of Hosts until He cometh to defend, to guide, to preserve, and to bless His Holy Church, and to pour abundantly upon her the manifold gifts of His heavenly graces.

O God, the Father of heaven; may He bless thee, and keep thee; may the Lord lift up the light of His countenance upon thee, and give thee peace now and for evermore.







